The University of Chicago
FOUNDED BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER

THE VERB AND THE SENTENCE IN CHRONICLES EZRA AND NEHEMIAH

PART OF A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND LITERATURE IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(DEPARTMENT OF SEMITICS)

BY
REBECCA CORWIN

BORNA NEAR LEIPZIG 1909
PRINTED BY THE DISSERTATIONS PRINTER ROBERT NOSKE

781
.53C
UNCLASSED
Dissertation

The University of Chicago
FOUNDED BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER

THE VERB AND THE SENTENCE IN CHRONICLES EZRA AND NEHEMIAH

PART OF A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS
AND LITERATURE IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(DEPARTMENT OF SEMITICS)

BY
REBECCA CORWIN

BORNA NEAR LEIPZIG 1909
PRINTED BY THE DISSERTATIONS PRINTER ROBERT NOSKE

To My Mother

In presenting a dissertation which gives the results of a study in Hebrew Syntax, I wish to acknowledge my great indebtedness to the late President William Rainey Harper. The problem was suggested to me by him and he indicated the method of working it out. President Harper ever emphasized the importance of philological investigation for a true understanding of Old Testament literature, history and theology, and it was in accord with his many-sided scholarship that philology lost none of its value as archaeology and the light from the monuments became preeminent in Old Testament research. I owe the greatest debt to him, however, for the inspiration which he imparted, for his personal sympathy in my work with him and for the broad view which he gave of the relation of Biblical study to all phases of human life.

I take this opportunity also to express my gratitude to Dr. Chester D. Hartranft who guided me in my earlier Biblical course at Hartford Theological Seminary. I received constant encouragement from him not only in the pursuit of theological studies but in the field of Semitic languages, and was made to realize the close relation between the science of theology and the science of language. The large ideals which he set forth and the generous assistance which he gave opened the way for my later work.

The debt which I owe to my other instructors I can not acknowledge in detail. I may, however, mention my deep obligation during my earlier years of training to Professors Lewis Bayles Paton and Duncan B. Macdonald, and in my work at the University of Chicago, to the late Professor George S. Goodspeed, to Professor Ira M. Price and to Dr. J. M. Powis Smith.

Contents.

Page

Introduction 1

A. Forms of the Verb and the Sentence in Chronicles and their Relation to the History of Language 6

I. The Use of the Tenses 6

II. The Place of the Verb in the Sentence 10

III. Different Kinds of Sentences 17

IV. The Infinitive 24

V. The Participle 34

VI. General Principles of Development 37

B. Conclusion in Regard to Kittel's Analysis 38

Appendix I. The Infinitive with לְ and the Conjunction וְ. 41

Appendix II. The Authorship of the Thirteenth Chapter of Nehemiah from the Standpoint of Syntax 45

Introduction.

The language of the writings edited by the Chronicler has a twofold interest; it has peculiarities of form and expression which mark the style of the individual writer, but it also represents in many respects the stage of development through which the Hebrew language was passing at the time of the Chronicler.

Though written in a period of decadence, the Hebrew of these books is of importance for the history of language, since they hold an intermediate position between the old classical Hebrew on the one hand, and the „New Hebrew" on the other.[1]

Many of their peculiar usages lie in the field of syntax, and within this field a large number center about the verb and its relation to the sentence.

The following treatment of the subject represents the chief results of a study of the syntax which had as its aim the classification and formulation of the more important uses of the verb and forms of the sentence as they are found in these writings, and which endeavored at the same time to bring the forms used in Chronicles into comparison with those found in the special portions of the earlier historical books of the Old Testament of which the Chronicler has availed himself as sources.

For such a study the material of these books falls into four groups of very unequal length. Taken in their chronological order they are:

1. The passages which are parallel with the earlier historical books. These form a smaller proportion of the material than at first appears. In many parts the earlier text has been revised or enlarged, while in other cases an independent narrative of the same events is given. The result is that scarcely one third of

[1] Driver, L. O. T. p. 474. Compare Wellhausen's observation that the history of language is still at a very elementary stage in Hebrew. Prolegomena, p. 390.

the two books of Chronicles, or one fourth of the entire writings of the Chronicler including parts of Ezra and Nehemiah, coincides linguistically with the earlier historical books.

The parallel passages as they stand in Samuel and Kings may be traced back to some ten original sources all of which are more fully represented in these books than in Chronicles. They date from different periods, and the parts which are later in their authorship or which belong to the Deuteronomic compiler have many more forms in common with Chronicles than the extracts from the earlier historical sources. When the difference between the earlier and later parallel passages is sufficiently marked, it is generally noticed in making comparisons.

2. The memoir of Nehemiah. In Neh. 1 : 1—7 : 5 an extract from the memoir has been preserved with much exactness. Other parts have been worked over, and these also are included with the Neh. Mem. in giving enumerations; Neh. 7 : 6—73[a];[2] 11 : 1—24; 12 : 31—32, 37—40. In the thirteenth chapter, however, only those forms which clearly represent the style of Nehemiah are classed as his.[3]

3. The memoir of Ezra. The Ezr. Mem., some parts of which have been largely revised, includes Ezr. 7 : 27—8 : 34; chaps. 9 and 10; Neh. 7 : 73[b]—10 : 39.

4. The Chronicles sections, including the portions of Chronicles peculiar to these books, and also the passages from Ezra and Nehemiah which have been contributed by the editor.

The parts peculiar to Chronicles represent a number of different sources which have so many similarities of language and content that it has generally been regarded as unnecessary or impossible to distinguish them one from another.[4] The most complete analysis thus far offered is that of Kittel in the Handkommentar, in which he carries the division into sources much farther than in his earlier volume on Chronicles in the S. B. O. T.

The real bearing of syntax upon the analysis can only be determined by a detailed examination of the separate sections.

[2] Occasionally forms from 7 : 5—73[a] || Ezr. 2 : 1—70, are ascribed to the editor.

[3] Cf. Appendix II, pp. 45—51.

[4] Driver, L. O. T. p. 498, and other Introductions; Francis Brown, article „Chronicles", in Encyclopaedia Biblica.

The value of a general comparison is lessened by the various revisions which some parts have undergone and the final redaction of the whole by the Chronicler. However, even in a general study, a few differences in the main divisions may be observed, and for this purpose Kittel's analysis has formed the basis of comparison. The main divisions are:

a) An historical source dating from the exile.[5]
b) An early Levitical writing dating from 500 to 400 B. C.[6]
c) Writings from the Midrashim, c. 350 B. C.[7]
d) The parts contributed by the Chronicler, c. 300 B. C.[8]
e) Later additions in the interest of the temple singers.[9]

Not far from one half of the material is ascribed to the Chronicler himself although there are indications in many places that he has made use of unknown sources. The Midrashim contribute nearly one fourth of the whole, while the other three sources are comparatively brief.

Certain portions of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah are also the composition of the Chronicler. These are: Ezr. 1 : 1—4 : 7; 4 : 24; 6 : 16—7 : 11; 8 : 35, 36; Neh. 11 : 25—36; 12 : 1—30, 33—36, 41—47. In Neh. chap. 13., those forms which show close affinity with the writings of the Chronicler are enumerated as his. The Aramaic source has been altogether omitted. This analysis of Ezra and Nehemiah is based upon recent commentaries[10] with the exception of the thirteenth chapter of Nehemiah[11] which has been given a special study from the standpoint of

[5] Printed in heavy type in the Handkommentar.
[6] In German type.
[7] Marked M. or M².
[8] Marked Ch.
[9] Marked N., „Nachträge", or printed cursive.
[10] Guthe-Batten in the S. B. O. T.; Siegfried in the Handkommentar; Bertholet in the Kurzer Hand-Commentar. These writers agree approximately in the main divisions. Guthe, however, attributes Neh. 7 : 7—10 : 40 for the most part to documents of the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. Bertholet differs from Siegfried in that he regards Neh. ch. 10 as based upon the memoir of Nehemiah rather than that of Ezra. The syntax, however, does not favor his view.
[11] Appendix II pp. 45—51. One may question whether a closer examination and comparison of the syntax than has yet been made would not give results differing at many points from the recent commentaries as well as from the position of Charles C. Torrey who assigns so large a portion of these books to the Chronicler.

syntax and whose forms have been apportioned between the Chronicler and Nehemiah according to the results.

In determining the position which a form holds in the writings of the Chronicler it is sometimes necessary to distinguish between its use in the wholly new contributions of Chronicles, and that in those parts which are based upon earlier sources, whether parallel passages or extra-canonical writings. When the Chronicler works over his sources to a large extent, or makes additions to them, he sometimes adopts in his own composition the forms of expression which are found in the source. This is evident in his use of Aramaic in editing the Aramaic document, Ezr. 4 : 24; 6 : 16—17, as well as in some of the additions to parallel passages. There are narratives also which seem to have attained their present form as the result of several revisions or to have taken shape gradually as popularized history; e. g., 2 Ch. chaps. 24 and 32, compare 2 K. chaps. 12 and 18. In such passages therefore, not all the forms represent the style of the Chronicler or his main sources. Some of them betray rather the influence of the earlier source which lies at the basis of the narrative.

So also the smaller variations and brief insertions in the parallel passages do not always disclose the characteristics of the Chronicler. When the alterations accord with the Chronicler's manner of expression in his more original compositions, they may be regarded as indicative of his style; and there are a large number of such variations. But when, on the other hand, the alteration produces a form rarely or never used elsewhere in Chronicles, it is safe to conclude that it is either due to the influence of the source or it is merely a variant reading of the text.

In stating the actual number of times that a form occurs in each of the sources both the character of the particular sections in which it is found, and the proportionate length of the various sources to each other, should be borne in mind in order that the relative frequency of the form may be rightly estimated.

The extent of the parallel passages in proportion to the Chronicles sections is a little less than one to three. The memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah differ little from each other in length and the proportion of each to the Chronicles sections is about one to seven.

As a means of reaching accurate results the various uses of the verb and the different forms of the sentence were carefully

classified and formulated in tables which brought them into comparison as they were found in the main divisions, — the parallel passages, the Nehemiah Memoir, the Ezra Memoir, and the writings of the Chronicler. In a similar manner, the forms in use in the different sources peculiar to Chronicles as analyzed by Kittel were tabulated.

It has not been thought necessary, however, to embody these tables or to give the manifold details which called for consideration in connection with them in the following presentation. Rather it seemed sufficient simply to gather together the observations and conclusions resulting from such a study.

While the primary purpose has been to determine the characteristics of the verb and the sentence in Chronicles and to observe their relation to the development of language in so far as this might be disclosed through a comparison of the various sources, the secondary purpose has been to discover the bearing of syntax upon the literary analysis of the sources peculiar to Chronicles, especially as they have been worked out by Kittel. The effort has also been made in the two appendices to bring into application the results of such study, in the first place with reference to a problem of Hebrew Syntax, and in the second place as they give aid in the literary analysis of a particular section of these writings, viz. Neh. chap. 13.

In seeking light upon the problems of Chronicles from the study of a single aspect of the subject, it is evident that the conclusions drawn, while they have weight, can not claim to be final decisions. This is especially true in regard to questions of authorship, for the consideration of which the characteristics of the language are generally of less importance than the contents of the sections. Professor Torrey's articles in the American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, Vols. XXIV and XXV, discussing questions of authorship and sources came to my knowledge after my results were in type. But they would not have occasioned any change in my method of treating the subject, since his conclusions are in line with those of his earlier work to which I have made reference.

A. Forms of the Verb and the Sentence in Chronicles and their Relation to the History of Language.

In summarizing the more important characteristics of the verb and the sentence and in gathering together whatever light these sources yield in regard to the place of the special syntactical form in the history of the Hebrew language, we find that some of the usages show a clear development and stand out with more or less distinctness as belonging to the later Hebrew of the Chronicler's time. Occasionally the transition from the earlier to the later forms can be distinctly traced in its different stages through the sources used by the Chronicler. At other times the characteristic is clearly observed as belonging to these writings, but its place in the growth of the language can not be determined by a comparison of the sources of the Chronicler.

In the following summary of results therefore some of the characteristic forms of Chronicles are noticed in their relation to the history of language while others are simply stated as peculiarities of these writings without regard to their place in the development of the language.

I. The Use of the Tenses.

1. The perfect is rarely used of future events; in the few cases in which it occurs the editor is indebted to his sources.[12]

2. Chronicles shows a tendency to avoid the use of the imperfect with reference to past events. As frequentative imperfect it is not common[a] and in other constructions it is rare.[b] The

[12] The only cases are: the perfect of certainty, 1 Ch. 29:3; 2 Ch. 2:9; the prophetic perfect, 2 Ch. 20:37; the perfect as futurum exactum after temporal particles, 1 Ch. 17:11; 2 Ch. 36:21.

particle אָז, when indicating past time,[13] is uniformly followed by the perfect in preference to the more common Hebrew construction with the imperfect.[c] The same disinclination appears in the Chronicler's substitution of the perfect for the imperfect of Kings in two parallel passages.[14]

Rem. a. As frequentative in past time the imperfect is less common relatively to the length of the material in Chronicles than in the parallel passages. It is found 7 times in the parallels; in Chronicles it occurs 14 times, but half of these instances are clearly due to sources while it is probable that the Chronicler has borrowed in others.[15] It finds greater favor, however, in the Ezr. Mem.[16]

Rem. b. The imperfect of an accompanying event in past time is found only once in Chronicles (1 Ch. 11 : 8) over against 7 times in the parallels. In a temporal clause the imperfect with עַד represents past time in 2 Ch. 29 : 34, a passage from the Midrashim.

Rem. c. The perfect is used after אָז in 1 Ch. 15 : 2; 16 : 7; 2 Ch. 8 : 12, 17; 24 : 17. In the parallel passages, on the other hand, אָז of past time has the imperfect in 2 Ch. 5 : 2 || 1 K. 8 : 1; 21 : 10 || 2 K. 8 : 22; and also in a passage in which the Chronicler avoids it in his reconstruction of the text, 2 Ch. 8 : 1—2, cf. 1 K. 9 : 10—11; it has the perfect, however, in two other parallels, 1 Ch. 20 : 4 || 2 S. 21 : 8; 2 Ch. 6 : 1 || 1 K. 8 : 12. Both appear to be late additions.

3. The imperfect with modal significance is much more frequent than the imperfect expressing simple future time, occurring twice as often. It represents all of the various modal ideas and sometimes has a strong modal force. Among the more striking

[13] König, Syntax, § 137; Driver, Hebrew Tenses, § 27β; Ges.-Kautzsch, Hebräische Grammatik[27], § 107^c. It is followed by the imperfect representing future events, 2 Ch. 22 : 13; 1 Ch. 14 : 15 || 2 S. 5 : 24^a (different root in Samuel). Cf. König, § 139.

[14] 2 Ch. 12 : 11 || 1 K. 14 : 28 and 2 Ch. 22 : 6 || 2 K. 8 : 29.

[15] The influence of the source used is apparent in 2 Ch. 4 : 6; 24 : 11 (four times); 25 : 14^b (twice); 31 : 18. Compare its use in 1 Ch. 9 : 27, 28 (twice); 12 : 22; 23 : 14, and Ezr. 4 : 2.

[16] In the Ezr. Mem. it is found in Neh. 9 : 4, 27 (4 times), 28 (3 times); in the Neh. Mem. only in 11 : 17. Of especial interest as a late usage is the modal imperfect representing past time after words expressing desire or command (Driver § 39β) which occurs in several passages of Ezra and Nehemiah. It is found in indirect discourse, generally with the relative particle, Neh. 2 : 5; 7 : 65; 8 : 14, 15; 10 : 31; 13 : 1, 22; without a particle, Ezr. 10 : 8. It is not found in Chronicles.

examples are the potential imperfect in 2 Ch. 1 : 10[b], which takes the place of יוּכַל with the infinitive in the parallel, 1 K. 3 : 9, and the emphatic positive commands, 2 Ch. 19 : 9, 10[b]; 24 : 5. The modal sense is very common after interrogative and final particles and in conditional sentences.

4. The jussive, imperative, and cohortative present no unusual features other than their sequence which is marked by the partiality of the Chronicler for a succession of two or more of these forms united by the simple conjunction וְ. Sometimes this is for rhetorical effect. In more than half the cases, however, it is due simply to the Chronicler's choice of this manner of sequence in preference to a continuation of these forms by a perfect with waw consecutive; e. g., the jussives, 1 Ch. 12 : 17[b]; 13 : 2[b]; Ezr. 1 : 3, etc.; the imperatives, 2 Ch. 24 : 5; 35 : 4, 5, 6, etc.; the cohortatives, 2 Ch. 14 : 6; 20 : 9, etc. The parallel passages and the memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah offer occasional examples of imperatives with וְ, but it is rare that jussives and cohortatives are thus united by וְ in these sources.

5. Waw consecutive with the imperfect, although noticeably frequent in certain sections,[a] yet taking the writings as a whole, is less common than in the earlier sources. The proportion is a little more than two in the parallels to one in Chronicles. This is due partly to the statistical character of much of the material, and partly to the larger use of other sentence forms, especially the nominal sentence. It has, however, retained its manifold shades of meaning and often possesses a strong force.[b]

Rem. a. The grouping of the consecutive imperfects is noticeable in some parts of Chronicles. There is a succession of ten in a verse of four lines, 2 Ch. 28 : 15. It is remarkably frequent also in 2 Ch. 29 : 20—24, and chaps. 14 and 20, as well as other passages. In strong contrast to these narrative portions are certain of the descriptive Levitical sections in which there is a very marked absence of verbs; e. g., 1 Ch. 28 : 12—19; 23 : 24—32, etc.

Rem. b. The imperfect with waw consecutive is frequently adversative, sometimes even after a negative statement when כִּי might have been expected; e. g., 2 Ch. 1 : 11; 21 : 13[a]; 24 : 22; Neh. 13 : 2; and in the Ezr. Mem., Neh. 9 : 17. It is often explicative or epexegetical and in one instance replaces an explicative כִּי in a parallel passage, 2 Chr. 5 : 8 ‖ 1 K. 8 : 7. In verbal apposition it sometimes takes the place of an object clause: after אָמַר, 1 Ch. 14 : 12; 21 : 27;

2 Ch. 24 : 8; Neh. 13 : 9, 19; after וַיּוֹסִיפוּ, 1 Ch. 14 : 13; and probably after הֵחֵלּוּ, Ezr. 3 : 8. It is the equivalent of an adverbial expression, 2 Ch. 11 : 23; 19 : 4. There are abundant examples of its use as a consequence, a concluding summary, an amplification of a general statement, etc.

It is occasionally used as an apodosis after a nomen absolute, a causal sentence, or a time determination, though in these uses it has given place in large measure to the asyndetic perfect.

6. A tendency toward the disuse of waw consecutive with the perfect can be traced through the sources of the Chronicler very nearly in their chronological order. Its use is abundant in the parallel passages and there is a gradual decline as the sources become later in date until finally it is almost wholly rejected by the editor of Chronicles and the later redactor.[a] The disfavor in which the Chronicler holds the consecutive perfect is apparent also in his substitution of other verbal forms in its place in five parallel passages.[17]

The decline is particularly noticeable in the more simple sequences.[b]

Rem. a. Waw consecutive with the perfect occurs 82 times in the parallel passages and 26 times in Chronicles. But the decline is greater than the numbers indicate not only because the material of Chronicles is much greater in length, but also because eight out of the twenty-six cases in Chronicles must be recognized either as merely textual variations, or as due to the influence of a source.[18]

But the growing disuse of the consecutive perfect may also be traced within the Chronicles group of sources. Of the 18 cases which are found in the more original parts of Chronicles, 11 belong to the two brief earlier sources, 5 to the Midrashim, 1 to the parts attributed to the Chronicler, and 1 to the later additions.[19]

[17] 1 Ch. 17 : 10 ‖ 2 S. 7 : 11; 21 : 2 ‖ 2 S. 24 : 2; 2 Ch. 7 : 20 ‖ 1 K. 9 : 7; 8 : 12 ‖ 1 K. 9 : 25; 18 : 14 ‖ 1 K. 22 : 15.

[18] As variant readings of the text must be classed 2 Ch. 18 : 33, where the variation from the parallel passage, 1 K. 22 : 34, is contrary to the almost uniform custom of Chronicles (cf. Paragraph 4 above); also 1 Ch. 17 : 11 ‖ 2 S. 7 : 12 (the verb has probably fallen out of the text of Samuel; cf. Benzinger, Kurzer Hand-Commentar p. 56, and König, § 357 e) and 1 Ch. 17 : 17 ‖ 2 S. 7 : 19 (the text here is corrupt; cf., however, Driver, § 119). The influence of a source is seen in several passages in which it is clear from the context that the editor is indebted to his source for the use of this form; 1 Ch. 14 : 10[a] ‖ 2 S. 5 : 19; 2 Ch. 7 : 19 ‖ 1 K. 9 : 6; 7 : 20 ‖ 1 K. 9 : 7; 12 : 11 ‖ 1 K. 14 : 28; 2 Ch. 24 : 11.

[19] It occurs in the exilic historical source, 1 Ch. 4 : 10 (3 times); in the

The Neh. Mem., however, continues to use this form freely, employing it 16 times. It occurs 3 times in the Ezr. Mem.

Rem. b. Waw consecutive with the perfect is rare in Chronicles after an imperfect, a jussive, or an imperative, and is never found as the apodosis of a condition. A succession of several consecutive imperfects is also rare. There are only two instances and these are in the earlier sections; 1 Ch. 4 : 10 and 22 : 11. In the parallel passages, on the other hand, such a succession is frequent.

The falling off in the less common uses is not so marked although it is noticeable when the relative length of the sources is considered. It is used independently or in loose connection five times in Chronicles, and the same number of times in the parallels; e. g., 1 Ch. 9 : 26; 23 : 32; 2 Ch. 15 : 16; 33 : 6. In Chronicles alone it is found as apodosis after a nomen absolute; 2 Ch. 13 : 9; 19 : 12.

7. The use of the perfect with the simple conjunction ו gains in favor, and is much more frequent in the Ezr. Mem. and Chronicles than in the parallel passages.[20] A difference also is observable in the several sources of the Chronicles group, the Midrashim offering fewer examples than the remaining sections.[21]

The imperfect also, has simple ו more frequently than in the earlier books for the Chronicler decidedly prefers this method of sequence to waw consecutive with the perfect. Cf. Paragraph 4.

II. The Place of the Verb in the Sentence.

8. Although the greater number of verbal sentences have the regular order of words with the verb at the head of the sentence, yet the proportion of variations is unusually large. The verb is often preceded by another sentence member for the purpose

early Levitical source, 1 Ch. 15 : 12; 22 : 9, 10, 11 (twice); 28 : 7, 8[b]; 2 Ch. 19 : 10; in the Midrashim, 2 Ch. 15 : 6; 13 : 9; 12 : 7; 32 : 4; 20 : 16; in the parts due to the Chronicler, 1 Ch. 9 : 26; in the later additions, 1 Ch. 23 : 32.

[20] It occurs 5 times in the parallels, 8 times in the Ezr. Mem., 27 times in Chronicles. In the Neh. Mem. it is found only in a gloss, Neh. 12 : 39 b. (Cf. commentaries ad. loc.) In most cases it replaces a waw consecutive with the imperfect. It is, however, synonymous with a preceding perfect 6 times in Chronicles, twice in the parallels, and twice in the Ezr. Mem.

[21] It is found in the parts contributed by the Chronicler 16 times; 1 Ch. 22 : 18 (twice); 23 : 1; 29 : 17; 2 Ch. 1 : 8; 19 : 3; 33 : 19, 21; Ezr. 3 : 10; 6 : 17, 18 (Aramaic), 22; 4 : 24 (Aramaic); 8 : 36; Neh. 13 : 1, 30. In the Midrashim, 4 times; 2 Ch. 29 : 6, 19; 31 : 4, 7. In the earlier sections 6 times; 1 Ch. 7 : 21; 28 : 2; 2 Ch. 3 : 7; 7 : 12, 16; 33 : 14. In a later addition; 1 Ch. 8 : 8.

of emphasis or rhetorical effect. It has this position also in certain fixed forms of expression such as are found in genealogical or statistical tables. The chief peculiarity of the sentence in Chronicles, however, lies in the large number of complex or compound sentences which have arisen through various combinations and expansions of the different elements of the sentence. Such prolonged complex sentences often take the place of the succession of simple sentences which is found in classical Hebrew.

9. There is a remarkable decline in the use of the introductory וַיְהִי before an adverbial element. The position of a time determination before the verb is very common in Chronicles, — 71 instances; but the וַיְהִי which in earlier Hebrew introduces such a time element is omitted in sixty of these cases. In only four cases is וַיְהִי used in the entirely independent narratives of Chronicles and these belong to the Midrash sections.[22] The remaining seven cases are due to the influence of sources[23] which lie at the basis of the narrative in Chronicles and can not be attributed to the editor who nowhere uses this form in his own compositions. The case is very different in the parallel passages. In them the time element when it precedes the verb is introduced by the usual וַיְהִי in four-fifths of the instances. The few passages in which it is omitted are of late date.[24] In the Neh. Mem. וַיְהִי is frequently used, — 13 times, but the time determinations to which it is prefixed are often extended to very large proportions, — a step in the direction of the Chronicler's usage.

Not only is וַיְהִי wanting in the contributions of the editor of Chronicles but he further betrays his disinclination toward its use by eliminating it from several parallel passages in which Kings preserves it.[25]

10. Equally characteristic of Chronicles is the asyndetic perfect as apodosis after a time determination. It occurs 58 times. A similar usage is observed in the Ezr. Mem. where it occurs 8 times while

[22] 2 Ch. 12:1; 13:15; 20:1; 21:9.

[23] This is evident in the parallels, 1 Ch. 15:26, cf. 2 S. 6:13—16; 2 Ch. 22:8, cf. 1 K 10:10—14. But the sources affect the style also in 2 Ch. 24:4, 11, 23 and 25:14, 16.

[24] 2 Ch. 7:10 ‖ 1 K. 8:66; 13:1 ‖ 1 K. 15:1; 21:8 ‖ 2 K. 8:20; 23:1 ‖ 2 K. 11:4; 32:24 ‖ 2 K. 20:1.

[25] 2 Ch. 7:1 ‖ 1 K. 8:54; 7:11 ‖ 1 K. 9:1; 12:9 ‖ 1 K. 14:25; 34:8 ‖ 2 K. 22:3.

the asyndetic imperfect is found twice. In the parallel passages, on the other hand, there are only seven examples, all of them late.[26] Moreover there is a difference between Chronicles and the parallel passages in the character of the time determination before such an asyndetic apodosis. In the parallels it is mostly formal, and is always ב with a noun, בַּשָּׁנָה, בַּיָּמִים, בְּעֵת, or a similar expression, with the one exception of 2 Ch. 12 : 11 ‖ 1 K. 14 : 28, in which it is מִדֵּי with the infinitive. Chronicles, however, in contrast to the parallels, uses a variety of expressions as the time element: כ or ב with the infinitive, בְּעֵת with an infinitive or relative clause, ב or ל with a noun, אַחַר or אַחֲרֵי with a noun or pronoun or in the expression, אַחֲרֵי־כֵן.

The transitional stage between the classical וַיְהִי followed by the syndetic verb as apodosis and the later usage appears in a number of passages in which the Chronicler preserves the syndetic apodosis even when וַיְהִי has been lost from the protasis.[27] There is no case of this kind either in the parallel passages or in the Neh. Mem., and only one instance in the Ezr. Mem.

11. After a causal sentence or a condition, there is a contrast between the usage of Chronicles and that of the parallel passages in regard to the syndesis of the apodosis. In Chronicles the apodosis is asyndetic with a very few exceptions.[a] In the parallel passages it is regularly syndetic, the single exception being found in a late composition.[b]

In conditional sentences, the Neh. Mem. seems to hold an intermediate position; for while the parallel passages present no case of an apodosis of a condition without a conjunction, the Neh. Mem. has four such cases over against one with syndesis. But the order of words in the apodosis makes the want of syndesis less marked than in Chronicles.[c] It is noteworthy, however, that nearly all of the causal protases and conditions of the parallel passages are of late date[d] and although the syndesis of the apodosis is regularly observed in them, they are in line with the growing tendency toward the more complex sentence which is found in Chronicles.

[26] The references above in Note 24, not only omit וַיְהִי but have an asyndetic perfect as apodosis. Two other parallel passages which retain וַיְהִי, have an asyndetic apodosis; 2 Ch. 12 : 2, 11 ‖ 1 K. 14 : 25, 28.

[27] 1 Ch. 21 : 28; 2 Ch. 7 : 1; 13 : 1; 25 : 27; 26 : 19[b]; and probably also 2 Ch. 5 : 13, though the text here is difficult.

Nearly all the instances of a causal protasis standing before the main sentence in Chronicles are found in the Midrash sections and the early Levitical source.[e]

Rem. a. Only once is a causal sentence followed by a syndetic apodosis in Chronicles and then it is in a passage which is dependent upon sources or traditions, 2 Ch. 24 : 20[b]. Cf. Benzinger, p. 114 and other commentaries ad loc. In all the other ten instances of a causal protasis, the apodosis is asyndetic; 1 Ch. 5 : 1; 15 : 13; 29 : 3; 2 Ch. 2 : 10; 16 : 8; 20 : 37; 28 : 9, 23; and with partial syndesis after עַל־כֵּן or הִנֵּה, 2 Ch. 16 : 7[b] and 21 : 12[b]—14.

Likewise the conditional protasis is regularly followed by an apodosis without syndesis, while the syndetic apodosis occurs in only two passages. Without syndesis it is found: 1 Ch. 12 : 17 (twice); 13 : 2; 28 : 9 (twice); 2 Ch. 15 : 2[b] (twice); 20 : 9; 25 : 8; 30 : 9. The two passages in which the apodosis has syndesis are found, one in the early Levitical source, the other in a Midrash writing. In each case the protasis has a form which does not occur in any other conditional sentence in Chronicles and which therefore points toward the use of uncanonical sources. Thus in 2 Ch. 7 : 13—14 the threefold protasis has the particles אִם ... וְהוּא ... הֵן, and in the other passage, 2 Ch. 20 : 20[b], the conditions are implied in the imperatives.

Rem. b. The opposite conditions exist in the parallel passages. The apodosis after a causal protasis is syndetic in five cases including those with עַל־כֵּן and הִנֵּה, whereas only in one case is it without syndesis. This is a passage in the dedicatory prayer which is a late prophetical writing, 1 Ch. 6 : 8 || 1 K. 8 : 18. The conditional sentences in the parallel passages have their apodoses syndetic without an exception. There are 12 cases.

Rem. c. There is a noticeable difference between Chronicles and the Neh. Mem. in that the asyndetic apodosis of the latter is always an imperfect and is always preceded by the subject, object, or an adverb; whereas in Chronicles it may be either an imperfect, a jussive, or a cohortative, and the verb invariably stands at the head of the apodosis. Once in Chronicles it is a nominal sentence.

Rem. d. The parallel passages which have the causal sentence standing before the main sentence or apodosis, are found in the later or Deuteronomic sections of Kings. The only possible exceptions are 2 Ch. 1 : 11—12 || 1 K. 3 : 11—12 and 9 : 8[b] || 1 K. 10 : 9[b]. But the compiler may have revised his earlier sources in both cases.

Rem. e. Two passages which have the causal protasis may perhaps be ascribed to the editor of Chronicles, viz., 1 Ch. 5 : 1 and 2 Ch. 20 : 37. The former passage, however, is more likely an addition by another hand.

12. The tendency toward the asyndetic apodosis appears also when the protasis is a nomen absolute. But the change is more gradual here and the apodosis with the conjunction is still retained to some extent. As the sources advance in date, syndesis becomes less frequent while the use of the asyndetic apodosis increases.[a] In the parallel passages the apodosis without syndesis occurs only in one late passage, 2 Ch. 34 : 20 || 2 K. 22 : 18.

A nominal sentence as apodosis after a nomen absolute is frequent in Chronicles[b] whereas it is never found in the parallel passages outside of the closing formula of a reign, כְּתוּבִים (הֵמָּה) הֲלֹא.

Rem. a. The syndetic apodosis after a nomen absolute in Chronicles is most frequently found in the Midrash portions or the early Levitical source; 1 Ch. 28 : 5; 2 Ch. 13 : 9[b]; 19 : 10; 25 : 13; 34 : 6—7. It seems to be the work of the Chronicler, however, in 1 Ch. 5 : 18—19 and Neh. 13 : 4—5.

The asyndetic apodosis, on the other hand, while found in the various sections of Chronicles, is most common in the parts attributed to the editor himself or to later additions. Twice the Chronicler substitutes an asyndetic apodosis in the place of the syndetic apodosis of parallel passages; 1 Ch. 11 : 6 || 2 S. 5 : 8; 2 Ch. 15 : 16 || 1 K. 15 : 13.

Rem. b. In a few cases, — 4 times, the nominal sentence as apodosis after a nomen absolute has a participle predicate; 2 Ch. 16 : 9; 20 : 10—11; Neh. 12 : 22[a], 23[a]; 13 : 24[a].

The nominal sentence without a participle predicate occurs 17 times as apodosis after a nomen absolute. It is found mostly in the cumulative, almost amorphous, statistical tables of the Levitical sections; e. g., 1 Ch. 26 : 1, 23—24, 25, 29, 30; 2 Ch. 31 : 17 with אֵת of relation; 34 : 12[b]—13[a], etc.

13. There is a steady advance in the use of the asyndetic apodosis as the sources become later in date whether the protasis be a causal sentence, a condition, or a nomen absolute.

The proportion of the syndetic apodoses to the asyndetic in the parallel passages is about 3 : 1; in the Neh. Mem. it is 2 : 1; while in Chronicles it becomes 1 : 4. In the Ezr. Mem. there is but one instance of a syndetic apodosis over against fifteen without syndesis.

The large increase in the relative number of asyndetic apodoses in Chronicles and the Ezr. Mem. means also an advance in the use of the complex sentence with its subordination of one part of the sentence to another in form as well as in sense. The asyndetic apodosis is especially significant in view of the fact that the Chronicler generally shows a tendency toward a very full use of the conjunction waw in uniting coordinate sentences and parts of sentences. Only in special forms of sentence such as the concluding remark or summary, or the brief parenthetical or epexegetical clause, is the omission of the conjunction common. Moreover the Chronicler often uses the conjunction waw for emphasis and occasionally introduces even a dependent clause or phrase by the strengthening waw.[28] In the use of the asyndetic apodosis instead of the coordinated form with the conjunction, the writers of Chronicles therefore give evidence of a feeling for the close relation between the protasis and apodosis. There is not the strong emphasis and isolation of the main idea which is secured by the syndetic apodosis;[29] the protasis and apodosis become rather the interdependent parts of a complex sentence.

14. A greater freedom in regard to the position of the verb in the sentence is found in Chronicles than in the earlier sources. It is also characteristic of later Hebrew.

The placing of diverse elements before the verb is a favorite form of sentence in Chronicles. It occurs in only a few parallel passages and these are generally of late date. The Chronicler 4 times makes alterations in parallel passages which result in this form of sentence[a]

In many sentences in Chronicles the sentence members which precede the verb have been greatly extended by various modifications or additions[b] and the verb is thus removed at a distance from the beginning of the sentence. In some striking examples it falls at the close of a long and complex sentence[c]. A tendency in the same direction may be observed in some of the later parallel passages, but in none of them are the parts preceding the verb so greatly extended as in Chronicles. The Neh. Mem. and the Ezr. Mem. show a strong tendency toward the same sentence form as Chronicles.

[28] Cf. p. 43.

[29] Cf. Ges.-Kautzsch, § 143 d. and König, § 341 m -v.

Rem. a. Members of the sentence which are diverse in their character or in their relation to the sentence often stand together before the verb in Chronicles. Sometimes it is the subject, together with some other element of the sentence, which is placed before the verb, e. g., subject and object, subject and adverbial phrase, subject and predicate; or it is the object with an adverbial phrase or an adverb, or two prepositional phrases differing in character, etc. Such a combination of diverse elements precedes the verb 36 times in Chronicles. In the parallel passages there are only 6 cases, three of which are in a later source, 2 S. chap. 7. In the Ezr. Mem. sentences of this kind are found 4 times, and in the Neh. Mem. 5 times.

The preference of Chronicles for this form of sentence is also indicated in four passages in which alterations have been made in the parallel texts, bringing two members of the sentence before the verb, whereas in Samuel and Kings, one precedes and the other follows the verb; 1 Ch. 17 : 18^{b} || 2 S. 7 : 20^{b}; 19 : 13^{b} || 2 S. 10 : 12^{b}; 2 Ch. 1 : 16^{b} || 1 K. 10 : 28^{b}; 2 Ch. 6 : 30 || 1 K. 8 : 39. Compare 1 Ch. 5 : 11; 10 : 6^{b}; 22 : 3; 28 : 19; 29 : 17^{b}; 2 Ch. 31 : 5^{b}, 21; 34 : 8; 35 : 8, 20, etc.

Rem. b. Such extended elements are frequently found before either a syndetic or an asyndetic apodosis, and the lengthened protasis may be a time determination, a causal sentence, a nomen absolute, or a condition. The verb as apodosis thus follows diverse or complex time elements; 1 Ch. 21 : 28; 2 Ch. 5 : 13; 21 : 19; 24 : 11, 25; 34 : 3^{a}, 8, 14; 35 : 20^{a}; it follows a lengthened nomen absolute; 1 Ch. 5 : 18—19; 2 Ch. 7 : 21; 13 : 9; 19 : 10; 20 : 14; 25 : 13; 34 : 6—7; a complex causal protasis; 1 Ch. 19 : 3; 2 Ch. 16 : 7^{b}; 28 : 23; a group of sentences in a condition; 2 Ch. 7 : 13—14.

In many cases, however, the verb does not have the nature of an apodosis, but simply yields its place at the head of the sentence to other members which have extensive modifications. We then have a subject, object, or prepositional phrase, which is prolonged by many modifications, or which consists of many coordinated parts, standing before the verb. For examples, compare Rem. c.

Rem. c. In complex sentences of this kind the verb often gravitates toward the close of a long sentence. In some instances the verb as apodosis closes such a sentence; 2 Ch. 7 : 21^{a}; 15 : 8^{a}; 28 : 23.

Especially noticeable, however, is the length of some of the sentences in which the verb stands at or near the close of the sentence, but in which it can not be regarded as an apodosis. The verb is thus the closing word of a sentence of seventeen words, 2 Ch. 31 : 6, and one of

fourteen words, 2 Ch. 31 : 21. It is preceded by thirteen words, 2 Ch. 36 : 18. Very nearly as long are the following sentences in which also the verb is the closing word; 2 Ch. 7 : 11[b]; 29 : 19; 1 Ch. 28 : 8[a]; 2 Ch. 21 : 13[b]; and less extended; 2 Ch. 30 : 11; 35 : 8[a], etc. Compare 2 Ch. 2 : 14; 15 : 13; 32 : 31; 33 : 22[b]; 35 : 8[b], 9; Ezr. 1 : 11, etc.

Similar in the Ezr. Mem. are: Neh. 9 : 35 and Ezr. 9 : 13—14; and in the Neh. Mem.: 1 : 5; 2 : 16; 4 : 14; 5 : 14.

Sentences of this kind in Chronicles are not so remarkable for their frequency as for the fact that in many cases the extension is of unusual length.

In the parallel passages, although the verb is frequently preceded by extended parts of the sentence, especially in the later parts, there are no such marked examples of a verb at the close of a long, complex sentence.

III. Different Kinds of Sentences.

15. The interrogative sentence is not largely used in Chronicles. It is chiefly rhetorical and the Chronicler chooses always the more common particles.

It is a peculiarity of Chronicles in contrast to the earlier sources that the interrogative sense is sometimes carried over to a following coordinate sentence without a repetition of the interrogative particle; 1 Ch. 22 : 18; 2 Ch. 19 : 2; 20 : 6, 7; also in 1 Ch. 14 : 10, the interrogative sense passes over to the second sentence whereas in the parallel text of 2 S. 5 : 19 the particle הֲ is repeated in the second question. Sometimes the interrogative idea is continued by means of the simple conjunction and sometimes by waw consecutive.

This usage does not occur in the parallel passages or in the Ezr. and Neh. Mem's.

16. The short negative clause is one of the peculiar characteristics of Chronicles; לֹא and אֵין are frequently used as the negation of an infinitive with לְ;[30] the brief clauses with לֹא, בְּלֹא, לְלֹא[31] and a noun, or with אֵין, לְאֵין, עַד־לְאֵין,[32] are shortened forms of relative, circumstantial, concessive, or consecutive clauses.

[30] Cf. Paragraphs 35 and 36, Rem. c.

[31] 1 Ch. 2 : 30, 32; 12 : 17, 33; 2 Ch. 13 : 9[b]; 15 : 3; 21 : 20; 30 : 17, 18.

[32] 1 Ch. 22 : 3, 4; 2 Ch. 14 : 10, 12; 20 : 25; 21 : 18; 36 : 16; and in the Ezr. Mem., Ezr. 9 : 14; Neh. 8 : 10.

These short negative clauses are found more frequently in the Midrash sections than in other parts of Chronicles. The parallel passages and the Neh. Mem. offer no analogous cases.

17. The relative clause without a relative pronoun is frequent in Chronicles, occurring 18 times. It is peculiar in that its antecedent is generally determined whereas an undetermined antecedent would be expected in prose.[33] There is but one instance of an undetermined antecedent. In some cases, however, it forms an independent relative clause. It is never found in the parallel passages and there is but one doubtful case in the Neh. Mem.[34]

The article is used quite frequently as a relative pronoun in Chronicles, and שֶׁ occasionally. The former is always united with the perfect, the latter with a prepositional phrase. Both belong to later Hebrew and there is no case of either in the parallel passages or the Neh. Mem.[a]

The shortened relative clause is a noticeable characteristic of Chronicles. It generally takes the form of a prepositional phrase and its real character as an elliptical expression becomes evident when the shortened forms are compared with corresponding relative clauses which are found fully written elsewhere in Chronicles or in the parallel passages, and which contain the same phrases. These abbreviated relative clauses occur most frequently when the fully written clause would have צִוָּה, דִּבֶּר, נָתַן, הָיָה, or a verb similar in idea.[b]

The shortened relative clause is in accord with the elliptical manner of expression which manifests itself in many different ways in the Chronicler's writings generally. It finds especial analogy in the shortened comparative clause.[35] The same shortening process appears in certain uses of the infinitive, particularly the temporal and object infinitives.[36]

The retrospective pronoun is somewhat less frequent in

[33] Ges.-Kautzsch, § 155[d]. Cf. König, § 380.

[34] The antecedent is undetermined only in 2 Ch. 28 : 9[b]. It is determined, 1 Ch. 12 : 23; 29 : 1, 3; 2 Ch. 15 : 11; 18 : 23; 30 : 17, 18[b], 19[a]; 31 : 19[b]; Ezr. 1 : 6; Neh. 11 : 17. The asyndetic relative clause is used independently, 1 Ch. 15 : 12[b]; 2 Ch. 20 : 22; 24 : 11; 29 : 27. Independent also are the brief negative clauses, 2 Ch. 13 : 9[b]; 14 : 10; Neh. 8 : 10; and a short positive clause, 2 Ch. 16 : 9.

[35] Paragraph 23.

[36] Paragraphs 31, 37, and 50.

Chronicles than in the parallel passages. Its use is relatively greater in the asyndetic clauses.

Rem. a. The article: 1 Ch. 26 : 28; 29 : 8, 17; 2 Ch. 1 : 4; 29 : 36; and in the Ezr. Mem., Ezr. 8:25; 10:14, 17. שֶׁ: 1 Ch. 5 : 20; 27 : 27b: Ezr. 8 : 20.

Siegfried also regards כָּל־הַבָּא in Ezr. 9 : 13 as a perfect and the article as a relative pronoun. But it is more natural to take כָּל־הַבָּא here as well as in Neh. 9:33, as a participle after the analogy of כָּל־הַנִּבְהָל in Neh. 10 : 29. Cf. כָּל with the participle, Paragraph 46.

Rem. b. We have the fully written relative clause, אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה ..... עַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל, in 1 Ch. 16:40 and 22:13. Exactly the same idea is expressed in the elliptical form, עַל with a noun or suffix, 2 Ch. 8 : 15; 24 : 9, 27; 28 : 13; 32 : 25; Ezr. 3 : 3, 7; 7 : 6, 11b; and probably, 1 Ch. 28 : 19.

Again we have the fully written relative clause, אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה אֹתָם עַבְדִּי מֹשֶׁה in the parallel passage, 2 K. 21 : 8. Chronicles abbreviates it to בְּיַד־מֹשֶׁה, 2 Ch. 33 : 8, and uses בְּיַד similarly in 1 Ch. 11 : 3; 2 Ch. 13:8; 26 : 11; 34 : 14; 35 : 6; and probably, 2 Ch. 7 : 6.

In the same way, instead of the full clause, אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתִּי עַל־הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה, 2 K. 22 : 19, Chronicles gives us אֶת־דְּבָרָיו עַל־הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה, 2 Ch. 34 : 27. Analogous are: מִיַּד ..., 2 Ch. 30 : 6, 16; 31 : 13; and probably 1 Ch. 28 : 19; מִפִּי ... 2 Ch. 35 : 22; 36 : 12b; בְּפִי ..., 2 Ch. 36 : 21, 22; עִמָּכֶם, 2 Ch. 20 : 17; מִן־הַחֹרֵב, 2 Ch. 36 : 20.

The relative clause is shortened in a different manner in the expression, כְּיַד־אֱלֹהַי הַטּוֹבָה עָלַי, which is found in the Ezr. and Neh. Mem's; Ezr. 7 : 9; 8 : 18; Neh. 2 : 8. Compare the fully written clause אֶת־יַד אֱלֹהַי אֲשֶׁר הִיא טוֹבָה עָלַי, Neh. 2 : 18.

18. The circumstantial clause presents few peculiarities. It is often temporal in its coloring; occasionally it is causal or concessive. It is sometimes asyndetic, e. g. the short negative clauses.[37] Unusually frequent is the clause דְּבַר־יוֹם בְּיוֹמוֹ.[38] Compare אַפַּיִם אַרְצָה, 2 Ch. 20 : 18, and בַּצַּר לוֹ, 2 Ch. 15 : 4.

19. A subject clause, other than an infinitive, a participle, or an independent relative clause, does not appear in Chronicles or the parallel passages. In the Neh. Mem., however, a subject clause with אֲשֶׁר is found in 2 : 10 and 13 : 1; with כִּי, 6 : 1.

[37] 1 Ch. 2 : 30, 32; 12 : 33; 22 : 3; 2 Ch. 15 : 3; 21 : 20; 30 : 18.

[38] 1 Ch. 16 : 37; 2 Ch. 8 : 14; 31 : 16; Ezr. 3 : 4; Neh. 11 : 23; 12 : 47. Cf. König, p. 265, Note 1.

20. Object clauses with כִּי become less frequent in Chronicles. There are 16 instances in the parallel passages and 11 in Chronicles. When the relative length of the two writings is considered, the difference becomes more significant. The loss in frequency is due to the decided preference of Chronicles for the infinitive with לְ as an object clause. It is found 71 times in Chronicles, whereas it occurs but 23 times in the parallels. The same preference is seen in the Ezr. Mem. in which the infinitive with לְ is used 21 times as an object clause, while there are but three object clauses with כִּי. Peculiar, on the other hand, is the frequency of object clauses with particles in the Neh. Mem. (15 times), while the infinitive with לְ as object is found only 12 times.

The use of אֲשֶׁר in object clauses in the Neh. Mem. is exceptionally frequent, — it occurs 8 times.[39] Compare its use in subject clauses and the remarkable frequency of כַּאֲשֶׁר in temporal clauses in the Neh. Mem.[40] אֲשֶׁר in an object clause occurs 3 times in the Ezr. Mem., once in Chronicles, and once in the parallel passages.[41]

21. The causal particle כִּי is unusually frequent in Chronicles. It occurs 195 times over against 33 times in the parallels. This is due in some measure to the large use accorded it in explicative, parenthetical, and independent sentences. These sentences are also more frequent in the later parallel passages. Other causal particles are not used by the Chronicler except as they are taken from his sources. Interesting also is the use of בְּ with the infinitive in a causal sense 7 times in Chronicles,[42] whereas it occurs but once in the parallel passages.

22. Concessive clauses in Chronicles appear only in the form of circumstantial clauses or the brief negative clause with בִּלְתִּי, 1 Ch. 12 : 17.

23. The use of כַּאֲשֶׁר in comparative sentences is much less frequent in Chronicles than in the parallel passages; — it occurs 8 times in Chronicles and 14 times in the parallels. For the most part it is limited to the earlier sections of Chronicles.[43]

[39] Neh. 2 : 5, 7b, 8, 17; 4 : 6; 7 : 65; 13 : 19, 22.

[40] Paragraphs 19 and 25.

[41] Neh. 8 : 14, 15; 10 : 31; 2 Ch. 2 : 7; 2 Ch. 18 : 15 ‖ 1 K. 22 : 16.

[42] Paragraph 32.

[43] It is found in the early Levitical source, 1 Ch. 15 : 15; 22 : 11; 2 Ch. 2 : 2 (as correlative with the apodosis omitted); in the Midrash writings, 2 Ch.

It is twice avoided by the editor in his revision of parallel passages.[44]

Shortened forms of comparison, like the shortened relative clause, are characteristic of Chronicles. Especially noticeable is the use of כ with a verbal noun when כַּאֲשֶׁר with a verb might have been expected. These abbreviated comparisons take the place of comparative sentences which are found fully written in other parts of Chronicles.[a] There are contracted comparisons and brief formal expressions which are also elliptical in their character.[b] Still another shortened form is the infinitive with כ, which is twice used in comparisons in Chronicles.[45] The parallel passages offer nothing similar to these shortened comparisons except the rare and late use of a formal phrase.[c]

Different, and scarcely the composition of the Chronicler, is the one instance of a poetical form of comparison.[d]

Rem. a. The full form, כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה ..., is found in 1 Ch. 15 : 15, and elsewhere; the abbreviated form, כְּמִצְוַת, takes its place, 2 Ch. 8:13; 29 : 15; 30 : 6; 35 : 15, 16; Neh. 12 : 45. We have the full form, כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר ..., 2 Ch. 23 : 3, and the abbreviated form, כִּדְבַר, 1 Ch. 11 : 3; 2 Ch. 35 : 6.[46] Similar is the comparison, כְּמִשְׁפַּט דָּוִיד, 2 Ch, 8 : 14.

Rem. b. כ with a noun forms a contracted comparative sentence, the verbal predicate of which must be supplied from the context; כְּכָל־אֲבֹתֵינוּ, 1 Ch. 29 : 15; and כְּעֶמְקֵי הָאֲרָצוֹת, 2 Ch. 13 : 9. Brief formal comparisons are: כַּכָּתוּב, 2 Ch. 23 : 18; 30 : 5, 18; 31 : 3; 35 : 12, 26; Ezr. 3 : 2, 4; and in the Ezr. Mem., Neh. 8 : 15; 10 : 35, 37; כְּדֵי בָנוּ, Neh. 5 : 8; and כַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה, Ezr. 9 : 7, 15; Neh. 9 : 10.

Rem. c. In the parallels, כַּכָּתוּב is found in 2 Ch. 25 : 4 ‖ 2 K. 14 : 6, and כַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה[47] in 2 Ch. 6 : 15 ‖ 1 K. 8 : 24, both passages of late date.

Rem. d. One of the two nouns to be compared is the subject and the other the predicate of a nominal sentence, 1 Ch. 12 : 9[b], וּפְנֵי אַרְיֵה פְּנֵיהֶם, their faces (were like) the face of a lion (Ges.-Kautzsch, § 141 c. d.).

29 : 8; 30 : 7; it is a variation in a parallel, 2 Ch. 23 : 3, cf. 2 K. 11 : 4. Only in 1 Ch. 24 : 19 and Ezr. 4 : 3 can it be attributed to the Chronicler himself.

[44] 1 Ch. 19 : 2 ‖ 2 S. 10 : 2; 1 Ch. 21 : 19 ‖ 2 S. 24 : 19.

[45] 2 Ch. 21 : 13; 33 : 23.

[46] In these two references, the shortened comparative clause also contains a shortened relative clause. Cf. Paragraph 17, Rem. a.

[47] König classes this as a modal clause, § 402 u, cf. § 388[b].

24. Adversative sentences several times have the rare and late particle אֲבָל, in Chronicles and the Ezr. Mem.[a]

There is a distinction in Chronicles and the Neh. Mem., between the two adversative particles, כִּי and כִּי אִם, which follow a negative statement; the particle כִּי is used only in simple adversative statements, while כִּי אִם uniformly introduces an exceptive clause.[b] This distinction does not appear in the parallel passages; in them the simple adversative idea is expressed both by כִּי and כִּי אִם, more frequently, however, by the latter.[c] Alterations in several parallel passages confirm the usage which is observed in the Chronicles sections, limiting כִּי אִם to exceptive clauses.[d]

This distinction naturally leads to a greater prevalence of the adversative כי after negative statements. It is found 20 times in Chronicles and only twice in the parallels, and one of these cases is of very late date.[48]

It is noticeable, however, that Chronicles several times uses waw consecutive with the imperfect in an adversative sense even when it follows a negative statement.[49] There is one such case in the parallel passages. The simple conjunction וְ often expresses the adversative idea in all the sources.

Rem. a. The adversative אֲבָל is not used outside of Chronicles, Ezra, and Daniel, in the Old Test. In Chronicles and Ezra it always follows a positive statement and the connection is loose, with the idea „nevertheless, but";[50] 2 Ch. 1 : 4; 19 : 3; 33 : 17; Ezr. 10 : 13. It is found only in the sections ascribed to the Chronicler himself, and Ezr. 10 : 13 is probably due to his hand also.

Rem. b. Exceptive clauses with כִּי אִם are found in 1 Ch. 15 : 2; 2 Ch. 2 : 5; 21 : 17; 23 : 6; also 1 Ch. 2 : 34 and 23 : 22, where לֹא ... בָּנִים כִּי אִם בָּנוֹת is exceptive in idea; in the Neh. Mem., 2 : 2, 12.

Rem. c. Four out of the five cases in which כִּי אִם is found in the parallels are simple adversative statements while only one is exceptive, 2 Ch. 18 : 30 ‖ 1 K. 22 : 31.

Rem. d. In three parallel passages Chronicles substitutes כִּי in the place of כִּי אִם in simple adversative sentences: 2 Ch. 6 : 9 ‖ 1 K. 8 : 19; 18 : 7 ‖ 1 K. 22 : 8; 25 : 4 ‖ 2 K. 14 : 6. In only one instance

[48] 1 Ch. 21 : 24 ‖ 2 S. 24 : 24, and 2 Ch. 8 : 9 ‖ 1 K. 9 : 22, a late addition.

[49] Compare Paragraph 5, Rem. b. It occurs also in the parallel, 1 Ch. 13 · 13[b] ‖ 2 S. 6 : 10.

[50] Kōnig, § 372 b. In Daniel it follows a negative statement, 10 : 7, and a positive statement, 10 : 21, and the connection is equally loose.

does the Chronicler preserve the כִּי אִם of Kings unaltered in such a sentence, 2 Ch. 18 : 17 || 1 K. 22 : 18.

25. Temporal clauses with particles are rare in Chronicles, the infinitive with prepositions having taken their place to a large extent. The particle כִּי is never found, and the particles עַד and אֲשֶׁר, either alone or in combination, are found only 5 times,[51] while there are 54 temporal infinitives.[52] The proportion of temporal clauses with particles to temporal infinitives in Chronicles is about 1 : 11; in the parallel passages it is not far from 1 : 4 (6 clauses with particles and 20 infinitives, excluding the set expression בִּמְלֹךְ of the framework of Kings).

Remarkable is the use of כַּאֲשֶׁר as a temporal particle in the Neh. Mem., — 10 times, and עַד־אֲשֶׁר twice, in this brief writing.[53] Compare the use of אֲשֶׁר in subject and object clauses in the Neh. Mem.[54] In Chronicles the temporal כַּאֲשֶׁר occurs only as a variant reading of the text in the source used, 1 Ch. 17 : 1 || 2 S. 7 : 1. It is found in one parallel, 2 Ch. 25 : 3 || 2 K. 14 : 5.

26. Chronicles greatly prefers the infinitive with לְ to every other form of final sentence. The conjunction וְ with an imperfect, jussive, or cohortative is next in favor. The final particles, לְמַעַן and אֲשֶׁר, are rare. There are 163 final infinitives, 13 final sentences with וְ and an imperfect or modal form, 4 with final particles.[55]

27. The consecutive clause most frequently takes the form of an infinitive in Chronicles, — 14 times, generally with לְ, occasionally with מִן of negative consequence.[56]

The short negative consequence with לְאֵין, once עַד־לְאֵין, is peculiar to Chronicles and the Ezr. Mem.[57]

[51] 2 Ch. 21 : 15 b; 26 : 15 b; 29 : 34; 35 : 20; 36 : 21. Since 1 Ch. 17 : 1 clearly gives only a textual variation in the sources, it is not enumerated as the Chronicler's usage. Cf. 2 S. 7 : 1. In the Ezr. Mem. a particle is used, Ezr. 8 : 29 and 9 : 18.

[52] Compare Paragraphs 31 and 50.

[53] The former, Neh. 3 : 33; 4 : 1, 6, 9; 5 : 6; 6 : 1, 3, 16; 7 : 1; 13 : 19; the latter, 2 : 7; 4 : 5.

[54] Paragraphs 19 and 20.

[55] Those with final particles are: 1 Ch. 28 : 8; 2 Ch. 1 : 11 b; 31 : 4; 32 : 18 b. In the Ezr. Mem. only Ezr. 9 : 12; in the Neh. Mem. only Neh. 6 : 12 (twice).

[56] Paragraph 39.

[57] 1 Ch. 22 : 4; 2 Ch. 14 : 12; 20 : 25; 21 : 18; 36 : 16; Ezr. 9 : 14. Cf. Paragraph 16.

A consecutive clause follows an interrogative sentence,[58] with כִּי, 1 Ch. 29 : 14; 2 Ch. 32 : 14; with אֲשֶׁר, 2 Ch. 2 : 5.

IV. The Infinitive.

28. The infinitive absolute as a cognate or absolute accusative falls into disuse in Chronicles. In the four instances in which it occurs it has been adopted from earlier sources.[a] The Chronicler's disinclination toward the use of this form is evidenced also by his omission of it, or his substitution of another form in four parallel passages.[b]

On the other hand there is a marked advance in the use of the infinitive absolute as the continuation of a finite verb; it is found 5 times in Chronicles, 3 times in the Ezr. Mem., once in the Neh. Mem., but never in the parallel passages.[59]

It occurs several times in the more uncommon uses. It is used independently in the place of a finite verb, 2 Ch. 31 : 10, where three infinitives absolute in succession represent the imperfect. It is governed by a preposition similar to the infinitive construct in the expression, עַד־לְכִלְּה or עַד־כַּלּוֹת.[60] It has passed over into an adverb in the form לְהַרְבֵּה.[61]

Rem. a. The cognate infinitive absolute is never found in the more original parts of Chronicles. It can be traced back to sources in the few passages in which it occurs: (1) 1 Ch. 4 : 10 is of doubtful origin but is based on earlier sources.[62] (2) 1 Ch. 21 : 17 is found in a narrative taken from an earlier source, which is based upon the parallel account in 2 S. chap. 24, though distinct from it.[62] (3) 2 Ch. 32 : 13 is in the letter of Sennacherib which is a part of the popularized history of his invasion preserved in the Midrashim. The parallel, 2 K. 18 : 33, contains a similar infinitive absolute, though from a different root. (4) In 2 Ch. 36 : 15, both the thought and the language have a

[58] Ges.-Kautzsch, § 166 b. König, § 395.

[59] 1 Ch. 5 : 20 b; 16 : 36 b; 21 : 24 b (the form here is infinitive construct, but cf. Ges.-Kautzsch, § 113 z, and König, § 413 t, and p. 115 Note 8); 2 Ch. 7 : 3; 28 : 19. In the Ezr. Mem., Neh. 8 : 8; 9 : 8, 13. In the Neh. Mem., 7 : 3.

[60] 2 Ch. 24 : 10; 29 : 28; 31 : 1; Ezr. 9 : 14 b. Compare the same prepositions with the infinitive construct of this verb, 1 Ch. 28 : 20. Cf. König, § 225[b] and Ewald, § 315 d.

[61] 2 Ch. 11 : 12; 16 : 8; Neh. 5 : 18. Cf. Ges.-Kautzsch, § 113 h.

[62] Cf. commentaries ad loc.

kinship with the writings of Jeremiah, which suggests that the Chronicler has borrowed from them.[63]

Rem. b. The infinitive absolute as cognate or absolute accusative is found seven times in parallel passages, in four of which the Chronicler makes alterations, either omitting the infinitive absolute or substituting for it another form; 1 Ch. 14 : 10 b || 2 S. 5 : 19 b; 2 Ch. 6 : 2 || 1 K. 8 : 13; 7 : 19 || 1 K. 9 : 6; 2 Ch. 25 : 19 || 2 K. 14 : 10. In the last of these הִנֵּה takes the place of the infinitive הַכֵּה of Kings. Benzinger and Kittel emend the text of Chronicles to agree with Kings. But this is unnecessary, for whether הִנֵּה be a scribal error due to its resemblance to הַכֵּה in appearance, or an intentional alteration, it is very natural that the editor should have made such a change since he clearly rejects the cognate infinitive absolute in the other three passages. Moreover הִנֵּה with a perfect in direct discourse, finds an analogy in 2 Ch. 29 : 9.

29. The infinitive construct in Chronicles often has the character and construction of a substantive. This is true not only of the infinitive without a preposition[a] but also of a few verbs when governed by a preposition which retains its more distinctive meaning.[b] This usage is in accord with a tendency of later Hebrew. In Chronicles it is found chiefly in the sections assigned to the editor, or, in two cases, to the later redactor, with the exception of הִתְיַחֵשׂ. It finds an analogy in the nominalized infinitive בִּמְלֹכוֹ of other late writings, especially the framework of Kings.

Rem. a. The infinitive construct without a preposition approaches closely to the substantive in idea and construction in the following passages: as a genitive, כֹּל הָעֲלוֹת, 1 Ch. 23 : 31: כְּלֵי שָׁרֵת, 2 Ch. 24 : 14 (twice); coordinated with a preceding noun by וְ, 2 Ch. 33 : 19; Neh. 12 : 46. It is more fully nominalized in the case of הוּסַד, 2 Ch. 3 : 3, which is used as predicate, and הִתְיַחֵשׂ, which is frequently found as a substantive in its various uses, subject, predicate, etc. Cf. Rem. b.

Rem. b. The infinitive construct is used almost as a substantive when governed by a preposition which retains its more distinctive meaning; בְּהַכֵּל, 2 Ch. 7 : 6; Ezr. 3 : 11[a]: עִם הֵעָלוֹת, Ezr. 1 : 11; בְּהַעֲלוֹת, 2 Ch. 35 : 14; עַל־הוֹדוֹת וְהַכֵּל, 1 Ch. 25 : 3; עַד־לָבוֹא, 1 Ch. 5 : 9; 13 : 5; 2 Ch. 26 : 8[b]; לָבוֹא, 2 Ch. 33 : 14; also לְ in the place of a genitive after

[63] Cf. Jer. 26 : 5; 29 : 19; 35 : 14, and Benzinger, p. 135. Also Ges.-Kautzsch, § 133 k and König, § 329 v.

שְׁנַת or שָׁנָה, in לְמָלְכוֹ, 2 Ch. 16 : 13; 17 : 7; 29 : 3; 34 : 3, 8, and לְבוֹאָם, Ezr. 3 : 8. Similar is הִתְיַחֵשׂ with ב of norm, 1 Ch. 5 : 7, and with מִלְּבַד, 2 Ch. 31 : 16. With לְ, however, הִתְיַחֵשׂ always has its verbal force, 1 Ch. 5 : 1; Neh. 7 : 5. Cf. Rem. a.

30. The infinitive without a preposition is rare in Chronicles. Aside from those which approach the substantive in meaning (Paragraph 29, Rem. a), there are only four infinitives without prepositions in Chronicles, while there are more than four hundred with prepositions. These four are genitives after עֵת or יוֹם, and thus form a temporal element; 2 Ch. 18 : 34; 21 : 19; 26 : 5[b]; 28 : 22.

The infinitive without a preposition is never found as subject or object, the infinitive with לְ having uniformly taken its place in these constructions.

31. The temporal infinitive in Chronicles is most frequently introduced by ב, — 23 times, or by כ, — 12 times. But we often find it also governed by other prepositions,[a] viz., מִן, עַד or עַד־לְ, לִפְנֵי, אַחֲרֵי, עִם. With these prepositions it is the result of the same tendency toward abbreviated expression which we find in shortened relative and comparative sentences. Like them it is characteristic of later Hebrew. A few late parallel passages[b] have a similar use of the infinitive with אַחֲרֵי, לִפְנֵי, and מִדֵּי.

It is noticeable that מִן with the infinitive has this temporal significance only in Chronicles and the Neh. Mem. In the parallel passages מִן is never used in a temporal infinitive clause, but it quite frequently expresses negative consequence, — 4 times. In Chronicles, on the other hand, it is more frequently temporal than negative consequence; the former 4 times, the latter 3 times.

Rem. a. The temporal infinitive is found with other prepositions than ב and כ in the following passages: with מִן:[64] 1 Ch. 8 : 8; 2 Ch. 11 : 4; 25 : 14; 31 : 10; Neh. 4 : 15; עד, 1 Ch. 4 : 31; 6 : 17; 2 Ch. 8 : 16; 29 : 34; 36 : 16, 20; Neh. 4 : 15; 7 : 3, 65; עַד־לְ, 2 Ch. 26 : 16; 28 : 20; 29 : 28; 32 : 24; אַחֲרֵי, 2 Ch, 25 : 14; לִפְנֵי, 2 Ch. 33 : 19; עִם, Ezr. 1 : 11.

Rem. b. Temporal infinitives with ב or כ are quite frequent in the parallel passages also, but a large majority of them are found in the later sections; ב is so used 9 times, and also is found in the late formal expression בְּמָלְכוֹ 16 times; כ is found 6 times. Other prepositions with temporal infinitives are: אַחֲרֵי, 2 Ch. 26 : 2 ‖ 2 K. 14 : 22; לִפְנֵי, 1 Ch. 1 : 43 ‖ Gen. 36 : 31; מִדֵּי, 2 Ch. 12 : 11 ‖ 1 K. 14 : 28.

[64] König, § 401 b i; similarly with a noun, 1 Ch. 6 : 16.

32. The causal infinitive with ב is quite frequent[65] in Chronicles, — 7 cases, whereas it occurs in only one parallel passage. It is noteworthy also that a number of the temporal infinitives with ב have a strong causal coloring.[66] A difference is observable here between the sources of the Chronicles group: the infinitive with ב causal, or temporal-causal, is much more frequent in the Midrashim and the early Levitical source than in the Chronicler's compositions. Only 1 Ch. 5:1 and 2 Ch. 20:37 may perhaps be attributed to him. The latter passage, however, Benzinger regards as a Midrash.

A causal infinitive is once governed by עַל, Ezr. 3:11 b.[67]

33. The conditional infinitive with ב is rare and late both in Chronicles and in the parallel passages. In Chronicles it occurs only in the Midrash source designated M[2] by Kittel, 2 Ch. 15:2; 30:9. In the parallel passages, it is found only in the prayer of Solomon, 2 Ch. 6:26 || 1 K. 8:35; (2 Ch. 6:24) || 1 K. 8:33. In the latter passage, Chronicles substitutes אִם with an imperfect.

34. The less frequent uses of the infinitive with prepositions are the following:

ב in a modal clause,[68] 2 Ch. 7:6; Ezr. 3:11 (3 times); 9:5 (?).

כ in a comparative clause, 2 Ch. 21:13; 33:23.

עַל as remote object, 1 Ch. 29:9; in the sense of accompaniment, „with", 1 Ch. 25:3 (governing two infinitives).

מִן as negative consequence;[69] 2 Ch. 11:14; 25:13; 36:13.

לְמַעַן in a final clause, 2 Ch. 25:20.

עַד־ל in a final clause, Ezr. 10:14.

35. The infinitive with לְ is remarkable in Chronicles both for its frequency and for its peculiarities in usage. It occurs 346 times and forms not far from seven-eighths of the infinitive clauses of Chronicles.

Especially interesting is its use as a subject or predicate infinitive.

The infinitive with לְ as subject is one of the most char-

[65] 1 Ch. 5:1; 29:3; 2 Ch. 2:10; 16:7,8; 20:37; 28:6; and the parallel, 2 Ch. 9:8 || 1 K. 10:9.

[66] 1 Ch. 15:26; 2 Ch. 12:12; 13:15; 15:9; 20:29.

[67] König, § 403 f.

[68] König, § 402.

[69] Cf. Paragraph 31; König, § 406.

acteristic usages of Chronicles. It occurs 18 times. It is never used, however, as the subject of any verb except הִיה; rather it is always the subject of a nominal sentence, הִיה forming a copula in the two instances in which it is found.

Most frequently the subject infinitive is found with יֵשׁ, אֵין or לֹא, and conveys the idea of general possibility, obligation, or intention.[70] This is the form with two-thirds of the subject infinitives. Generally these particles are copulative and the sentence is completed by a dative with לְ, or by עַל with a suffix. In several passages, however, there is a simple negation of the infinitive with לְ by means of אֵין without any predicate.[a]

Another form of sentence with subject infinitive has the same idea of purpose or possibility: but this thought lies not so much in the infinitive itself as in its relation to the predicate which is generally עִם לְבַב ··· (לְבַב), expressing purpose or intention. In one passage the predicate is בְּיָדְךָ in the sense of power or possibility. The same usage, with עִם לְבַב ··· as predicate, is found twice in a late parallel passage, the dedicatory prayer. The predicate always precedes the infinitive with לְ in these sentences.[b]

Different is Neh. 13 : 27 where לַעֲשׂוֹת is best construed as the subject of the passive perfect, הִנָּשְׁמַע.

Rem. a. The infinitive with לְ is used with יֵשׁ, 2 Ch. 25 : 9 b; אֵין, 1 Ch. 23 : 26; 2 Ch. 22 : 9; 35 : 15; לֹא, 2 Ch. 20 : 17; 26 : 18; Ezr. 4 : 3; הֲלֹא, 2 Ch. 13 : 5. In all of these passages there is a dative with לְ as predicate. A similar use of the subject infinitive is found in Ezr. 10 : 12 and Neh. 13 : 13 b: but in both passages יֵשׁ is omitted and עַל with a suffix forms the predicate. The same ideas are expressed in a more general and indefinite manner when there is a simple negation of the infinitive by אֵין, without a predicate. 2 Ch. 5 : 11; 20 : 6; Ezr. 9 : 15.

Rem. b. A subject infinitive has עִם לְבַב ··· (לְבַב) for the predicate, 1 Ch. 22 : 7; 28 : 2; 2 Ch. 24 : 4; 29 : 10, and the parallels, 2 Ch. 6 : 7, 8 1 K. 8 : 17, 18; it has בְּיָדְךָ, 1 Ch. 29 : 12 (twice).

‖ 36. Equally characteristic of Chronicles is the periphrastic or predicate infinitive with הָיָה expressed or understood.[a] It is found in its twofold significance expressing sometimes the idea of being ready or about to act,[b] but still more frequently conveying

[70] König classes them as subject infinitives, § 397 d–i; cf. Driver, § 202 and Ges.-Kautzsch, § 114 l.

the idea of destination, obligation or necessity.[c] It occurs 17 times in Chronicles, but never in the parallel passages or the Ezr. and Neh. Mem's. The negative לֹא is used with it in three cases.

Rem. a. That this infinitive with לְ is a predicate, and not an „entfernteres Objekt", as König regards it (§ 399 χ—s), is clear in Chronicles, not only from the sense of the passages in which it is found, but from the analogy of nouns used in a similar construction. Thus we have a noun with לְ as predicate of a nominal sentence expressing exactly the same idea, viz., that toward which the subject is directed or for which it is destined, 2 Ch. 28 : 21 b; 32 : 2 b. In 2 Ch. 30 : 9 also a noun with לְ has this construction and sense, and with it is coordinated by וְ an infinitive with לְ which must be regarded as having the same thought and the same construction as predicate. Cf. Ges.-Kautzsch, § 114 h, and Driver, § 204, cf. § 203.

Rem. b. When it has the idea of being directed toward an act, ready or about to act, this infinitive resembles the first periphrastic conjugation of Latin; it has הָיָה expressed, 2 Ch. 26 : 5; 28 : 23 b; הָיָה is omitted and the subject supplied from the context, 2 Ch. 11 : 22; 12 : 12 a (וְלֹא).

Rem. c. At other times it has the idea of destination, obligation, or necessity, similar to the second periphrastic conjugation of Latin. הָיָה is never expressed with the infinitive in this sense in Chronicles; — 1 Ch. 5 : 1 (לֹא); 9 : 25; 15 : 2 (לֹא); 22 : 5; 23 : 4; 2 Ch. 4 : 6 b; 8 : 13; 13 : 11; 19 : 2; 25 : 9; 30 : 9; 36 : 19.

37. The infinitive with לְ as object or accusative is also very common in Chronicles. It is found after a number of verbs and has a variety of uses.[a] Most interesting as reflecting a later usage is its use after אמר,[b] the object infinitive thus taking the place of the direct discourse of earlier writings. It is frequent in Chronicles and the Ezr. Mem., but is very rare in the parallel passages.

Of the same nature is the infinitive with לְ as object ad sensum, or in apposition, which follows certain expressions involving the idea of speaking.[c] This infinitive has arisen along with the tendency toward the use of indirect discourse. It is especially common in the Ezr. Mem., but is frequent also in Chronicles. The few cases in the parallel passages are all in one late document, the temple records.

Rem. a. The infinitive with לְ as object is very frequent after אמר (cf. Rem. b); it is often found after יָכֹל, — 9 times, e. g. 2 Ch. 7 : 2, 7;

29 : 34, etc.; and after הֵחֵל, — 9 times, e. g. 2 Ch. 31 : 7, 10; 34 : 3, etc.; also after a number of other verbs: צִוָּה, (c f. R e m. b); יָדַע, 2 Ch. 2 : 6, 7, 13; נָתַן, 1 Ch. 16 : 7; 2 Ch. 20 : 10; Neh. 2 : 12; יָצַץ, 2 Ch. 25 : 16, etc.

But the object or accusative infinitive is not always a direct object. It is sometimes the object a d s e n s u m (c f. R e m. c). It is object after Hiphil forms which serve as the equivalent of an adverbial modifier:[71] הִרְבָּה, 2 Ch. 36 : 14; Ezr. 10 : 13; הִרְשִׁיעַ, 2 Ch. 20 : 35; הִפְלִיא, 2 Ch. 26 : 15. It is remote object (c f. König, § 399 v, „entfernteres Objekt"): after שָׁמַר, 1 Ch. 22 : 13: after בָּחַל Ezr. 4 : 4; and more frequently in the Ezr. Mem.: after בּוֹשׁ, Ezr. 8 : 22; 9 : 6; after שׁוּב, Ezr. 9 : 14 (twice); Neh. 9 : 28. It is an accusative with intransitive or reflexive verbs: with נוֹעַץ, 2 Ch. 30 : 2, 23; 32 : 3; רָצָה, 1 Ch. 28 : 4; נִדְחַק, 2 Ch. 26 : 20; הִתְנַדֵּב, 1 Ch. 29 : 5; Neh. 11 : 2; also in the Ezr. Mem. with מֵאֵן, Neh. 9 : 17; and the Neh. Mem. with חָפֵץ, Neh. 1 : 11; מָשַׁר, Neh. 4 : 2.

R e m. b. אמר is followed by an object infinitive with לְ 20 times in Chronicles and 3 times in the Ezr. Mem. but never in the Neh. Mem. Of the two instances in the parallel passages, one is poetical, 2 Ch. 6 : 1 ‖ 1 K. 8 : 12 and the other is by the editor of Kings, 2 Ch. 21 : 7 ‖ 2 K. 8 : 19. Examples in Chronicles are: 1 Ch. 13 : 4; 15 : 16; 22 : 2, etc.; — in the Ezr. Mem., Neh. 8 : 1; 9 : 15, 23.

צִוָּה with the infinitive object is found in the place of אמר as a command only in the early Levitical source of Chronicles; 1 Ch. 22 : 6, 17; 2 Ch. 7 : 13. Even here, however, אמר is more common. Compare the same use of צִוָּה, Neh. 5 : 14.

R e m. c. The infinitive with לְ as object a d s e n s u m or in apposition is remarkably frequent in the Ezr. Mem., — 9 times, and somewhat frequent in Chronicles, — 6 times. It is found after various phrases involving the idea of speaking, commanding, or a similar meaning: נָתַן קוֹל, 2 Ch. 24 : 9; גָּלִיתָ אֶת אֹזֶן, 1 Ch. 17 : 25. Compare other expressions, 2 Ch. 15 : 12; 30 : 1, 5 (two different phrases); Ezr. 8 : 17 (לְהָבִיא); 10 : 3. 7, 19; Neh. 9 : 8 (twice); 15; 10 : 30, 35. The three instances of this usage in parallel passages are all of late date: 2 Ch. 23 : 16 ‖ 2 K. 11 : 17; 2 Ch. 34 : 31 ‖ 2 K. 23 : 3; (2 Ch. 34 : 27) ‖ 2 K. 22 : 19. (Chronicles gives a different text here.)

38. The final infinitive, which is very frequent in Chronicles (c f. Paragraph 26), has as its chief peculiarity the tendency to combine

[71] Ges.-Kautzsch, § 114 n and Note 1; König, § 399 k—q.

some other meaning with that of purpose. This is especially evident after the verb בָּחַר; the infinitive then unites the thought of effect or result with that of purpose and becomes almost equivalent to a predicate accusative. It is frequent in Chronicles and is found once also in a late parallel passage, the dedicatory prayer.[72]

At other times the thought of motion, or direction toward, lies within that of purpose, and the infinitive becomes almost an indirect object; this is found most frequently after the verb נָתַן[73] but is also to be observed after הֵכִין and סוּת.[74] It is common in Chronicles and occasional in the Ezr. Mem., but is never found in the parallel passages or the Neh. Mem.

39. The infinitive with לְ as consequence is quite frequent in Chronicles.[75] It is especially noticeable after עָצַר כֹּחַ, יֵשׁ כֹּחַ, and אֵין כֹּחַ.[76] Whenever it is found in the parallel passages it belongs to the late sources or the compiler of Kings.[77] Compare the infinitive with בְּלִי as negative consequence, Paragraph 34.

40. The gerundial infinitive with לְ (excepting לֵאמֹר) is one of the most characteristic features of the syntax of Chronicles and the Ezr. Mem. It is found 34 times in Chronicler and 11 times in the Ezr. Mem. Its twofold use is represented: most frequently it explains the circumstances or nature of a preceding action;[a] but it also occasionally has its other function, that of following a comparison with the meaning „in respect of".[b] All of the eight parallel passages in which this infinitive is found are late.[c] It is not found in the Neh. Mem.

The decline in the use of the formal adverbial infinitive, לֵאמֹר, which introduces direct discourse, is very marked in Chronicles in contrast to the parallel passages. It occurs 33 times in the parallels and 22 times in Chronicles. But its decline may also be observed within the Chronicles group of sources: it is much more common in the Midrashim and in the brief earlier sources

[72] 1 Ch. 15 : 2 (twice); 28 : 4, 5, 10; 2 Ch. 6 : 5 b; 29 : 11. Compare the parallel, 2 Ch. 6 : 6 b ‖ 1 K. 8 : 16 b. Cf. König, § 327 t. and u β.

[73] 1 Ch. 22 : 19; 2 Ch. 11 : 16; 20 : 3; 32 : 11; Neh. 9 : 17 (the Ezr. Mem.).

[74] 1 Ch. 21 : 1; 28 : 2; 2 Ch. 12 : 14; 18 : 2; 19 : 3; 30 : 19; Ezr. 7 : 10 (3 times).

[75] 1 Ch. 4 : 10; 17 : 11; 28 : 7; 30 : 12; 35 : 16, Ezr. 6 : 22. Cf. König, § 406 e.

[76] 1 Ch. 29 : 14; 2 Ch. 2 : 5; 20 : 37; 25 : 8; and the Ezr. Mem., Ezr. 10 : 13.

[77] 2 Ch. 6 : 16, 23 ‖ 1 K. 8 : 25, 32; 2 Ch. 33 : 6 b, 9 ‖ 2 K. 21 : 7, 9.

(18 times) than in the parts assigned to the Chronicler himself. In these it occurs in only four instances, three of which give indications that sources have been used. It is frequent in the Neh. Mem.

Moreover, it follows a word which has the idea of speaking less uniformly in Chronicles than in the parallel passages.[d]

Rem. a. In the following passages the gerundial infinitive explains the circumstances or nature of a preceding action:[78] 1 Ch. 10 : 13 (לְדָרְשׁ); 12 : 32, 33, 36; 15 : 16[b] (לְהָרִים־בְּקוֹל), 19, 21; 17 : 21; 22 : 5 (לְהַגְדִּיל); 25 : 5; 2 Ch. 5 : 13 (3 times); 6 : 31; 9 : 8 (לְהַעֲמִידוֹ) 20 : 11 (לָבוֹא), 18; 22 : 3, 7 (לָבוֹא); 25 : 19; 28 : 13; 30 : 12 (לָתֵת); 31 : 21; 32 : 31 (לְנַסּוֹתוֹ): 34 : 33; Ezr. 3 : 12 b.

In the Ezr. Mem., Ezr. 8 : 21 b; 9 : 8 (4 times), 9 (twice לָתֵת ··· וְלָתֵת) 10 : 10b; Neh. 9 : 12, 19 (twice).

Rem. b. It follows a term expressing comparison; 1 Ch. 12 : 8; 2 Ch. 14 : 10; 29 : 34b. It has the same meaning, „in respect of", after an adjective, 2 Ch. 2 : 6.

Rem. c. In the parallel passages it always has its chief function, that of explaining the circumstances (cf. Rem. a). and is always late; the majority of instances are in the dedicatory prayer, 2 Ch. 6 : 19, 20b, 22, 23 (twice לָתֵת ··· לָתֵת) ‖ 1 K. 8 : 28, 29b, 31, 32; but it is found also in other late passages, 2 Ch. 20 : 32 ‖ 1 K. 22 : 43; 34 : 21b ‖ 2 K. 22 : 13b; 34 : 31b ‖ 2 K. 23 : 3b.

Rem. d. In some passages in which לֵאמֹר is used the idea of speaking is absent from the preceding context; it follows וַיִּבְנֵהוּ, 2 Ch. 20 : 8; בָּא, 2 Ch. 25 : 7; וַיִּסְטְרוּ, 2 Ch. 32 : 4; מַסִּית, 2 Ch. 32 : 11; נִגְּשׁוּ, Ezr. 9 : 1.

41. When the infinitive construct is governed by any preposition except לְ, its subject is generally expressed by a following substantive or pronominal suffix. This is the form in about three-fourths of the cases.

The infinitive with לְ on the other hand, very rarely has the subject expressed. It can generally be identified, however, with some member of the main sentence. In a few cases it is indefinite, 2 Ch. 4 : 6; 30 : 5; 35 : 16, etc. The subject of an infinitive which approaches the substantive in meaning is often indistinct, e. g. 2 Ch. 24 : 14; Neh. 12 : 46.

[78] Driver, § 205; Ges.-Kautzsch, § 114 o; Davidson, Syntax, § 93; König, § 402 χ—ε, „Infinitivische Modalsätze".

42. There are occasional irregularities in the order of words of the infinitive clause. The most interesting are the few cases in which the object precedes the infinitive after the manner of Aramaic, 2 Ch. 19 : 2 (the object has לְ); 28 : 10; 31 : 7, 10.[79]

43. The infinitive clause usually follows the main sentence. Certain forms, however, precede the verb. Causal and conditional infinitives with בְּ always precede the main sentence with the one exception of a causal infinitive in 2 Ch. 28 : 6. The temporal infinitive with כְּ regularly precedes the verb which it modifies in all the sources.[a] The temporal infinitive with בְּ precedes the main sentence in a large majority of the cases in Chronicles, but this is not the usage in the parallel passages.[b] The final infinitive almost invariably follows the verb.[c]

Rem. a. The single exception to this rule in any of the sources is Ezr. 8 : 9. In the parallel passages, however, the temporal infinitive with כְּ always has וַיְהִי prefixed.

Rem. b. The temporal infinitive with בְּ precedes its verb much more frequently in Chronicles than it follows, — 15 times it precedes, 8 times it follows. The opposite usage prevails in the parallel passages; in them it follows the verb 8 times and precedes it only once, 1 Ch. 11 : 2 || 2 S. 5 : 2, where it serves to amplify another time determination. The formal infinitive, בִּמְלֹךְ, which is so common in the framework of Kings (cf. Paragraph 31, Rem. b) also follows the verb regularly.

Rem. c. A final infinitive with לְ stands before the verb in 2 Ch. 35 : 22, and in two other passages in which it is probably a later insertion or a gloss; 2 Ch. 34 : 8; 36 : 22 || Ezr. 1 : 1.[80]

Kittel finds this order of clauses in two other passages; 1 Ch. 25 : 5 and 2 Ch. 9 : 8. He departs from the Massoretic accents and translates the infinitive as modifying the following verb which, in both cases, is an imperfect with waw consecutive. He gives these infinitives a final significance. But in both passages they are better construed as gerundial infinitives dependent upon the preceding sentence. Compare Benzinger's rendering of 1 Ch. 25 : 5, pp. 75—76.

[79] Ges.-Kautzsch also mentions here 2 Ch. 36 : 19 b, with an interrogation, § 142 f, Note 2; but it is better to construe this infinitive as a predicate infinitive of destination. Cf. Paragraph 36, and König, § 399 a.

[80] Kittel and Benzinger consider the infinitive of 2 Ch. 34 : 8 a gloss. Cf. Siegfried on Ezr. 1 : 1.

V. The Participle.

44. A number of participles in Chronicles have passed over into substantives, e. g. מְשֹׁרְרִים, שֹׁעֲרִים, פְּקוּדִים, מְנֻצָּח, יוֹצֵר, חֹצֵב, חוֹשֵׁב, etc. Others waver between the substantive and the participle in construction, e. g. יוֹשֵׁב, מְשֻׁרָתָיִם, מֵבִין, מְשֹׁרֵר, etc.

The participle which has the government of a noun in Chronicles generally stands in apposition with a preceding noun, and is itself in the construct state before a following genitive, either noun or suffix, e. g. יוֹדְעֵי, 1 Ch. 12 : 32; נוֹשֵׂא, 1 Ch. 15 : 26; כֹּרְתֵי, 2 Ch. 2 : 9, יוֹצֵא and אֹחֵז 2 Ch. 25 : 5. שֹׁבְיָם, 2 Ch. 30 : 9, etc. Occasionally such a participle has another construction than apposition: e. g., it is predicate, 1 Ch. 9 : 30; governed by a preposition, 2 Ch. 30 : 9, etc.

45. The participle which has the government of a verb[81] shows an advance over the parallel passages in several ways. Such verbal participles are found in apposition with a noun much more frequently in Chronicles than in the parallel passages, — 3 times in the parallels, 14 times in Chronicles.[82] There is a similar advance in the use of this participle as the equivalent of an independent relative clause, — 13 times in the parallels, 48 in Chronicles; this is especially noticeable when the independent clause is in the genitive relation after a noun in the construct[83] or כל (cf. Paragraph 46), or when it is governed by a preposition.[84] There is also decided progress in the use of the participle as the predicate of a sentence, — 58 times in the parallels (omitting the formula הֲלֹא כְתוּבִים) and 144 times in Chronicles.

In the Neh. Mem. the frequency of the participle with verbal government is remarkable, especially when used as predicate, — 114 participles in this short document, and not far from three-fourths of these are predicate participles. This is a much greater proportion than in Chronicles, where somewhat more than half of the participles are predicates.

[81] Many participles stand alone without a modifier and can not be called either nominal or verbal in government. This is especially the case with certain passive participles. They are classed here as verbal in government, since they have retained to some extent their verbal force.

[82] 1 Ch. 12 : 2; 27 : 32; 2 Ch. 2 : 6, 11, 12, 13; 20 : 24 b, etc.; and passive, 1 Ch. 7 : 40; 2 Ch. 25 : 17, etc.

[83] 1 Ch. 16 : 41; 2 Ch. 34 : 17, etc.

[84] 2 Ch. 2 : 9; 15 : 5; 28 : 12.

46. The participle as genitive after כֹּל is a favorite form of syntax in Chronicles and the Ezr. Mem., and is generally verbal in government.[a] It is unusual in the parallel passages.[b]

Rem. a. The participle with כֹּל occurs 15 times in Chronicles and 7 times in the Ezr. Mem.[85] It is verbal in its government with the exception of Ezr. 8 : 22 (twice), where the participle forms a construct with a following genitive.

Rem. b. Of the three occurrences in the parallel passages, two are Deuteronomic or late, 2 Ch. 7 : 21 ‖ 1 K. 9 : 8 and 34 : 21 ‖ 2 K. 22 : 13. The third is an earlier passage and כֹּל with the participle forms a casus pendens, 1 Ch. 11 : 6 ‖ 2 S. 5 : 8 (cf. Ges.-Kautzsch, § 116 w). Only two of the cases in Chronicles form a casus pendens (2 Ch. 13 : 9; Ezr. 1 : 4). The remainder are variously construed as subject, object, governed by a preposition, etc.

The participle with כֹּל never occurs in the Neh. Mem.

47. A large majority of the participles which are attributive or are the equivalent of an independent relative clause, have the article. Those in apposition, even when verbal in government, are generally without the article.

48. The participle with הָיָה is often found in Chronicles but it is exceptionally frequent in the Neh. Mem.[a] It is a late usage similar to the Aramaic. The difference between the parallel passages and Chronicles lies not so much in the relative frequency of the participle with הָיָה, as in the fact that in Chronicles, as also in the Neh. Mem., the participle with הָיָה in a number of cases is active with full verbal force,[b] whereas in the parallels it is generally passive or stative[c] and therefore almost an adjective in sense, the הָיָה having more the function of a copula.

Rem. a. The participle with הָיָה is found 21 times in Chronicles, 18 times in the Neh. Mem., 10 times in the parallels, not at all in the Ezr. Mem. (cf. p. 46).

Rem. b. The participle with הָיָה is active in nearly every case in Chronicles. In some passages the active verbal force is strong; 2 Ch. 20 : 25; 24 : 12, 14; 30 : 10 (three times); 36 : 16 (three times); Ezr. 4 : 4 f. (three times). The following also are active in form, and

[85] 1 Ch. 16:40 (passive); 25:7; 2 Ch. 7:11; 13:9; 26:28; 29:29 (passive); 31:16; 34:12, 32, 33 (the last two passive); 35 : 7; Ezr. 1 : 4; 3 : 8; 6:21 (passive). In the Ezr. Mem., Ezr. 9:13; Neh. 8:2; 9:33; 10:29a (passive), 29b; and with the government of a noun, Ezr. 8 : 22 (twice).

to a large extent in meaning also; 1 Ch. 6 : 17; 15 : 25; 2 Ch. 5 : 8; 17 : 12; 26 : 10; 29 : 11 (twice); Ezr. 4 : 24 (Aramaic). Only in 2 Ch. 7 : 15, is the participle passive. König, § 239 b, includes as active participles with היה, those in 1 Ch. 12 : 39; but the participles are better understood here as secondary predicates.

Several times in Chronicles היה is used with a participle which has passed over into a noun or adjective; יוֹצֵץ, 2 Ch. 22 : 3, 4; נִכְבָּד followed by comparative מִן, 1 Ch. 4 : 9.

In the Neh. Mem. the participle with היה is active: 1 : 4 b (twice); 2 : 13, 15 (twice); 3 : 26; 4 : 10 (twice); 6 : 14 b, 19 (twice); 13 : 5, 22 (twice). It is passive: 1 : 6; 5 : 13, 18; 13 : 26.

Rem. c. The parallel passages on the other hand, offer only two examples of an active participle in this use; 1 Ch. 18 : 14 || 2 S. 8 : 15 and 2 Ch. 21 : 9 || 2 K. 8 : 21. The former is certainly late, and the latter probably so. In the remaining parallels the participle is passive, once stative, and is therefore more nearly related to the adjective in sense; 1 Ch. 17 : 14 || 2 S. 7 : 16; 19 : 5 || 2 S. 10 : 5; 2 Ch. 6 : 20, 40 || 1 K. 8 : 29, 52; 9 : 2, 8 || 1 K. 10 : 3, 9; 18 : 34 || 1 K. 22 : 35; and stative, 2 Ch. 10 : 6 || 1 K. 12 : 6.

49. A peculiar form in Chronicles is the participle which approaches closely to the infinitive in significance and construction, and has therefore the force of an abstract noun. It is not common however, — 3 instances in Chronicles and one in the Ezr. Mem.

In 1 Ch. 29 : 11 b, the participle וְהַמִּתְנַשֵּׂא is coordinated with an abstract noun, הַמַּמְלָכָה, and itself has the meaning of an abstract verbal noun. König, § 233 d, refers to it as a substantive with the function and construction of an infinitive.

In 1 Ch. 21 : 12 a, if the Massoretic reading is retained, לְמַשֶּׁחֶת must be understood as the equivalent of the predicate infinitive with לְ expressing destination, which is frequent in Chronicles. (Cf. Paragraph 36.)

In Neh. 10 : 29, which is a part of the Ezr. Mem., the participle מֵבִין takes the place of an object infinitive with לְ after יֹדֵעַ. (Cf. Paragraph 37, Rem. a and König, § 413 e; also a similar use of the participle, 1 S. 16 : 16.)

The fully nominalized participle, לְמִשְׁחִית, has a meaning akin to the final infinitive, 2 Ch. 20 : 23.

VI. General Principles of Development.

50. In following the details of syntax in their variation and development in the sources of Chronicles, the conclusion is reached that there are several principles at work in the language which have resulted in the peculiar usages of Chronicles. They have led to the breaking down of classical Hebrew at many points and to the adoption of new modes of expression; or they have given an unusual emphasis to forms which are comparatively rare in early Hebrew.

In the first place we find indications that the verb is weakening in that usage which has distinguished Hebrew from the other Semitic languages, the waw consecutive. This is not felt with the imperfect to any extent, but with the perfect the waw consecutive has almost disappeared in the later compositions of Chronicles. The simple conjunction with the verb, on the other hand, has gained steadily.

Another principle which has wrought many changes is the growth of the complex sentence. This has brought with it the falling away of וַיְהִי before an adverbial element, and the formation of a single sentence through uniting protasis and apodosis without a separating or coordinating conjunction. The same is true with other kinds of protases, the causal protasis, the nomen absolute and the condition. As a natural outcome of this development of the complex sentence has followed the gravitation of the verb toward the close of a long complex sentence in many cases. At the same time complex nominal sentences have arisen, especially when the predicate is a participle.

Again the tendency toward abbreviated forms of expression is responsible for many of the peculiar usages of Chronicles. The shortened clause in one form or another is met with at every turn. It has worked most effectually in producing the several kinds of brief relative clauses, the shortened comparisons, and the short negative clause with לֹא or אֵין and a noun.

As an outgrowth of these last two principles we have the remarkable development of the infinitive clause in Chronicles. That it has arisen along with the tendency toward shortened forms of expression is evident in the temporal, object, causal, conditional and comparative infinitive clauses governed by various prepositions and expressing ideas which would naturally have been

expressed in earlier Hebrew by a finite verb preceded by a particle or the conjunction וְ. That, on the other hand, it has grown out of the tendency toward the complex sentence is apparent in the many cases in which the infinitive with לְ takes the place of the direct discourse of earlier Hebrew. The two principles have worked together in the manifold development of the infinitive with לְ so that, in addition to its larger use in the more common constructions, it has advanced far beyond the earlier Hebrew in the great frequency with which it is used as subject, especially with יֵשׁ, אֵין, and לֹא, as predicate infinitive with הָיָה, as object, and as gerundial or adverbial infinitive.

Still another element which has worked changes in syntax is the influence of Aramaic. To this perhaps is due the larger use of the predicate participle and the participle with הָיָה. It is probable also that the development of the infinitive has been affected in some ways by Aramaic.

B. Conclusion in Regard to Kittel's Analysis.

Syntax lends support to Kittel's analysis in its general divisions. It favors the distinction between the three earlier sources on the one hand, and the work of the main editor and the additions of the later redactor, on the other hand. Certain points of syntax can be pointed out as characteristic of one or the other of these two groups. Syntax further shows a few points of difference between the two main early sources, the Midrashim and the early Levitical source.

I. The forms of syntax found in the earlier sources which are less common in the editor's contributions, or which do not appear at all in them, are:

(1) The perfect with waw consecutive.

(2) וַיְהִי prefixed to an adverbial element.

(3) A causal sentence as protasis.

(4) The conditional sentence.

(5) The short negative clause with לֹא or אֵין and a noun, forming relative, circumstantial, concessive or consecutive clauses.

(6) כַּאֲשֶׁר in comparative sentences.

(7) A final sentence with the final conjunction and an imperfect.

(8) A temporal clause with the particle עַד or אֲשֶׁר and a finite verb.

(9) Causal or temporal-causal infinitives with ב.

(10) The conditional infinitive with ב.

(11) The infinitive לֵאמֹר introducing direct discourse.

II. Forms characteristic of the editor which are rarely or never found in the earlier sources of Chronicles, are:

(1) The relative clause with שֶׁ or the article.

(2) אֲבָל as an adversative particle.

(3) The infinitive with עַד־לְ

(4) The infinitive with לְ as object ad sensum or as remote object.

(5) The nominalized infinitive, excepting הִתְיַחֵשׂ.

(6) In general, the more inextricable, cumulative, statistical method of expression.

III. The Midrashim and the early Levitical source differ from each other in regard to the following usages:

(1) The Midrashim retain the introductory וַיְהִי in several cases whereas the early Lev. source never makes use of it.

(2) The peculiar short negative clause is especially characteristic of the Midrashim and is rare in the early Lev. source. לֹא with a noun is never found as a negative clause in this source, and אֵין only in 1 Ch. 22 : 3,4.

(3) The perfect with waw consecutive is more frequent in the early Lev. source.

(4) The perfect with simple וְ is also more frequent in the early Lev. source, which is on a level with the Chronicler's additions in this respect.

(5) The early Lev. source has several cases of an object infinitive with לְ governed by צִוָּה which takes the place of the usual אָמַר ; צִוָּה does not occur in this use in the other parts of Chronicles. (Cf. Paragraph 37, Rem. b).

But while syntax gives a general confirmation of the analysis, it also testifies to the inadequacy of a formal analysis to show the real literary history of sources so complex as those in Chronicles. For it is often necessary to assign to the editor or to one of his sources material which has been worked over from time to time and whose final form, while representing the last editor, also bears the impression of the earlier revisions in the

language as truly as in the thought. Such a process of growth is clearly visible in parallel narratives of Chronicles which give a complete reconstruction of the corresponding narratives in Samuel and Kings. That these in their present form are not entirely the work of the editor of Chronicles but are due in some measure to an earlier reviser, is seen in the fact that they often have usages which are foreign to the Chronicler's style and which also are not to be found in the parallel passages of Samuel and Kings. They must therefore have come from the hand of an unknown reviser: e. g., in 2 Ch. 24 : 11 || 2 K. 12 : 11, there are indications of this kind, viz. the waw consecutive with the perfect as apodosis after a time determination, and the frequentative imperfects; and similarly in chap. 32 (cf. 2 K. 18), the infinitive absolute as cognate accusative, v. 13, and כְּמַצֵּנָ with the imperfect as a final clause in v. 18, a rare form in Chronicles and not used by the editor except in one other passage which is also based on a source.

In some of the passages which Kittel assigns to the editor of Chronicles the work is so largely due to those who have preceded the Chronicler as to suggest a different assignment of the material. For instance, the section 2 Ch. 36 : 12b—21, which Kittel assigns to the editor, while it has a number of the peculiar usages which belong to the Chronicles group of sources as a whole, nevertheless possesses none of the distinctive characteristics of the editor. There is a closer kinship with the Midrashim both in the general style and in one or two special points, e. g., the peculiar short negative clause with עַד־לְאֵין in v. 16. and the finite verb after a temporal particle in v. 21. But the passage also bears marks of still earlier influence in the infinitive absolute of v. 15. and the perfect as futurum exactum of v. 21. The language as well as the thought is related to passages in Jeremiah. The section therefore is mainly the work of an earlier writer and can not well be assigned to the editor of Chronicles. Compare Benzinger and Kittel, ad. loc.

Again the addition in 2 Ch. 25 : 14 – 17 can scarcely be the editor's own composition if we may accept the testimony of language. For there is not only an absence of the usages characteristic of the editor, but there are several forms to which he is averse. There is the וַיְהִי before a time determination, which is found twice in these few verses, and in both cases the apodosis is waw consecutive with the imperfect, a form avoided by the

Chronicler. There are also the frequentative imperfects of v. 14 a rare usage in Chronicles.

The general conclusion from a study of the analysis in the light of syntax may be summed up in two observations. In the first place, while the analysis justifies itself, it is evident also that there are more points of resemblance than of divergence in these sources and that they have a kindred origin. In the second place, very few sections of these writings are the result of individual authorship, either by the editor or by another writer. The greater part of the material has attained its present form by means of gradual growth and is the outcome of various revisions, reconstructions, and expansions of earlier sources.

Appendix I.

The Infinitive with לְ and the Conjunction וְ.

The infinitive with לְ is sometimes united to the preceding sentence, or to one of its members, by the conjunction וְ. Its character and its relation to the sentence must then be determined from the context. There are two possibilities; it may be coordinated with a preceding sentence or member of the sentence, or it may be a subordinate element of the sentence, which is introduced by an emphatic or epexegetical וְ.

There are a few passages in which the infinitive is clearly coordinated with a preceding member of the sentence. But in each of these cases the significance of the infinitive itself, as well as of the word with which it is coordinated, is one which is commonly expressed by the infinitive with לְ; together they form final elements of the sentence in two passages, and predicates of destination in a third passage. Thus in 1 Ch. 23 : 30, the final infinitive, וְלַעֲמֹד, is coordinated with preceding prepositional phrases which likewise have the significance of final object or end. Again in 2 Ch. 6 : 33, a final infinitive with לְ is coordinated with a final clause with לְמַעַן and an imperfect. This is not the continuation of a finite verb by an infinitive with לְ, but simply the coordination of two final clauses, alike in sense though different in form. A third example is found in 2 Ch. 30 : 9 where both the infinitive with לְ and the noun with לְ, with which it is coordi-

nated, are predicates conveying the idea of destination, a use of the infinitive which is common in Chronicles.

The real problem regarding the infinitive with וְ, however, arises when it follows a finite verb. Is it to be understood as continuing the finite verb and receiving from it person, gender, and number like the infinitive absolute which continues a finite verb? Or, on the other hand, is the infinitive with לְ a subordinate modifier, and the וְ which introduces it an emphatic or epexegetical וְ? A thorough comparison of the usages in Chronicles with respect both to the infinitive and to the conjunction proves very clearly that the answer is to be given in favor of the view that the infinitive is a subordinate clause modifying the main sentence and that the וְ is used for strengthening its force, either simply by way of emphasis, or as epexegetical. This, however, is not the answer usually given. Very frequently these infinitives are taken as continuing the finite verb; 2 Ch. 2 : 8; 7 : 17; Neh. 8 : 13; (and also 2 Ch. 6 : 33, cf. above); or as continuing a participle, 1 Ch. 6 : 34; 12 : 33. Cf. Davidson, § 96, Rem. 4; Ges.-Kautzsch, § 114 p; König, § 413 t—v. Sometimes, however, commentators prefer to emend the text rejecting the conjunction וְ; Kittel thus emends 2 Ch. 7 : 17, and Guthe and Bertholet emend Neh. 8 : 13 in a similar manner.

The reasons for the conclusion that the infinitive in these passages forms a subordinate clause, and that it is introduced by a strengthening וְ, are the following:

1. This is very evidently the construction in the case of two other infinitives in Chronicles and it is natural therefore to interpret the remaining infinitives after their analogy. In 1 Ch. 16 : 4 and 22 : 12 infinitives with לְ have the conjunction וְ, and in both cases the most natural and consistent interpretation is that the infinitive is an additional modifier of the verb, final in sense, and that the וְ is used for the purpose of giving emphasis to the infinitive. The conjunction therefore does not coordinate the infinitive but simply strengthens its force as a dependent clause, which supplements the preceding modifiers while it is distinct from them in character. It is natural to suppose that a construction which is so clear in two passages will serve as the best explanation of the remaining instances of this infinitive provided it gives a suitable connection with the context.

2. The context in the case of every infinitive of this kind favors its interpretation as a subordinate clause; for in each case it easily and naturally assumes a meaning which is in accord with the common uses of the infinitive with לְ in Chronicles, and finds its best connection with the main sentence when understood in this way. It is final in 1 Ch. 6 : 34; 2 Ch. 2 : 8; Neh. 8 : 13, as well as in the two passages considered above, 1 Ch. 16 : 4 and 22 : 12; it is gerundial in 1 Ch. 12 : 33; it is consecutive in 2 Ch. 7 : 17.

3. The partiality of Chronicles for an emphatic or epexegetical וְ with other dependent sentence members indicates that it has the same character when used with the infinitive with לְ. There are very marked examples of a modifying phrase or clause which is introduced by וְ when it might naturally have stood without syndesis. In some cases the וְ serves simply the purpose of emphasis; in others it is not only emphatic but epexegetical also. It is so used in the following instances: וְעַל־יְדֵי, 2 Ch. 29 : 27; וּלְכָל־הַכָּתוּב, 1 Ch. 16 : 40 b; וְלַבֹּקֶר לַבֹּקֶר, 1 Ch. 9 : 27 b; וּכְמִצְוַת‥‥ 2 Ch. 30 : 6; וְכַאֲשֶׁר, 2 Ch. 21 : 7; and probably with the infinitive with ב, וּבְקָרְעִי, Ezr. 9 : 5.

Analogous is the preference of the Chronicler for the simple strengthening וְ in the expression וְעַד when עַד would have been sufficient, 1 Ch. 5 : 8; 2 Ch. 34 : 6; Ezr. 4 : 5, etc.; and correlated with מִן, 1 Ch. 11 : 8; 13 : 5; 29 : 10; 2 Ch. 9 : 26; 15 : 13; 25 : 13; 30 : 5, 10. Similar is מִבֶּדֶר־וַמַּעְלָה, Ezr. 3 : 8.

When therefore the various instances in which the infinitive with לְ is found with the conjunction וְ are closely examined, it becomes evident that the infinitive with לְ is never used in Chronicles to continue a finite verb in a manner similar to the infinitive absolute. Nor is it ever coordinated with a preceding member of the sentence, except when such a member is used with a sense which is commonly expressed by the infinitive with לְ, and the coordination therefore brings two like members together. This, however, is of rare occurrence.

On the other hand there is conclusive evidence that this infinitive with the conjunction forms a subordinate clause which is made emphatic by the use of the וְ in analogy with a usage which is frequently found elsewhere in Chronicles.

In other late writings also, the infinitive with לְ which has the conjunction וְ, is often dependent upon the preceding sentence, rather than coordinate with it; for in these writings also, the use

of the emphatic or epexegetical וְ with certain subordinate clauses or phrases points toward a similar use of וְ with the infinitive. Compare the emphatic וְ with modifying phrases in Jer. 15 : 13 b and 42 : 21 b, with a similar use of וְ and the infinitive with לְ, Jer. 17 : 10; 19 : 12.

Note: There are two other passages which are sometimes classed with the infinitive introduced by וְ, although the conjunction is not immediately attached to the infinitive.

1. In 2 Ch. 8 : 13, the infinitive is regarded by Davidson (§ 96, Rem. 4) as a continuation of a finite verb (cf. v. 7). But it is better understood in the sense which König gives it, that of „destination for", „Bestimmtsein zu", the infinitive here representing the passive idea, [quod] offerendum. (König, § 399 a.) It then becomes a periphrastic or predicate infinitive with the subject (עוֹלוֹת) supplied from the preceding context. The וְ is epexegetical, but it introduces the whole sentence of which the infinitive is predicate rather than the infinitive itself. (König, § 375 c.)

2. In 1 Ch. 10 : 13 b, the infinitive clause, וְגַם לִשְׁאוֹל, is a continuation of a preceding causal phrase, עַל־דְּבַר־…. But this can scarcely be regarded as the regular infinitive with לְ; for the לְ here is the equivalent of the causal עַל, with which it is parallel, and which it replaces for the sake of dissimilarity of prepositions. In Chronicles this use of the preposition לְ as „dissimilirender Ersatz für sinnverwandte, und dann auch andere Präpositionen"[86] is a common usage; e. g., בִּין … לְ, 2 Ch. 14 : 10; 19 : 10 (twice); עִם … לְ, 1 Ch. 13 : 1; 28 : 1 b; אֶל … לְ, 1 Ch. 12 : 8; 2 Ch. 19 : 1; עַל … לְ, 1 Ch. 26 : 20.

The לְ here, therefore, differs from the לְ which has become essentially a part of the infinitive; it has rather the prepositional force of a causal עַל. (For a similar use of עַל with a causal infinitive by the Chronicler compare Ezr. 3 : 11 b; and for לְ, as a dissimilar causal preposition with an infinitive, compare Ezek. 13 : 22; where לְ is parallel with a preceding יַעַן, both prepositions governing infinitives. Compare also König, § 403 b, with § 319 o.)

[86] König, § 319 o.

Appendix II.

The Authorship of the Thirteenth Chapter of Nehemiah from the Standpoint of Syntax.

Old Testament scholarship has been almost unanimous in ascribing this chapter to the memoir of Nehemiah with the exception of the first three verses. These, it is thought, have been supplied by the Chronicler. The remainder of the chapter, vv. 4–34, is regarded as an extract from the memoir which has been „exactly reproduced" by the editor.[87] In the two latest commentaries it is classed with those parts of the Neh. Mem. which are „in unverändertem Wortlaute mitteilt"[88] or as „wörtliche Auszüge aus Nehemiah's Denkschrift".[89]

Charles C. Torrey[90] stands alone in his position that the Chronicler was the original author of this chapter as well as of other passages usually assigned to the Neh. Mem.

A comparison of the syntax of this chapter with the usages of the Neh. Mem. on the one hand, and those of Chronicles on the other hand, leads to the conclusion that neither of these views is entirely supported by syntax.

The following comparison includes the more important points which are easily observed in connection with the verb and the sentence. Neh. 1—7 : 4 (5—72?) has been taken as the basis of comparison assuming that we have here an extract from the memoir in approximately exact form, though doubtless it has been touched here and there by the hand of the editor.[91]

The content of this chapter and its general likeness to the Neh. Mem. lies wholly outside of this study; but in forms which are common both to the Neh. Mem. and to Chronicles, the resemblance in thought to the Neh. Mem. naturally favors this as the source. It must be remembered also that the brevity of the extract in the first seven chapters limits the field of comparison with the Neh. Mem., whereas there is large opportunity for comparison with Chronicles.

[87] Ryle, Cambridge Bible, Ezra and Nehemiah p. 307, Note on v. 4.
[88] Bertholet, Kurzer Hand-Commentar, Einleitung, III 2 (p. XIV).
[89] Siegfried, Handkommentar p. 9 § 2 d.
[90] „Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah."
[91] There is much in the syntax of 3 : 1–32 to favor Torrey's view that it is the composition of the Chronicler.

A. Points of syntax in this chapter which are characteristic of the Neh. Mem., but are rarely or never found in Chronicles.

1. אֲשֶׁר with a subject or object clause is found three times, vv. 1, 19 and 22. This is a characteristic usage of the Neh. Mem., occurring seven times in the first seven chapters (Paragraphs 19 and 20); but it is not used in Chronicles, with the one exception of 2 Ch. 2 : 7, a passage of the early Levitical source and probably based upon a still earlier source; cf. 1 K. 5 : 20.

2. The temporal clause with כַּאֲשֶׁר v. 19, is one of the remarkable peculiarties of the Neh. Mem. and occurs nine times in the first seven chapters. In Chronicles, כַּאֲשֶׁר is never used in this way, except as a variant reading of the text in 1 Ch. 17 : 1 ‖ 2 S. 7 : 1 (Paragraph 25).

3. The use of וַיְהִי before the time determination in vv. 3 and 19 is a very common usage in the Neh. Mem., occurring eleven times in chaps. 1—7. In Chronicles it is rarely found in the more original sections (only 4 times in the Midrashim, cf. Paragraph 9).

The apodosis which, in both cases, is an imperfect with waw consecutive, is the customary form in the Neh. Mem. (10 times). In Chronicles, it is rare and the asyndetic perfect is generally preferred (Paragraph 10).

4. In v. 23, גַּם before a time determination which might have had וַיְהִי prefixed, finds an analogy in Neh. 4 : 16. Chronicles generally omits the וַיְהִי without in any wise supplying its place. The Neh. Mem. never omits it except in 4 : 16 where גַּם takes its place. Compare a similar use of גַּם in 5 : 14, where, however, וַיְהִי would scarcely be expected because of the duration of time expressed in מִיּוֹם etc.

5. The apodosis of the condition in v. 21, which is asyndetic, but in which the imperfect is preceded by the object, resembles the Neh. Mem. rather than Chronicles. In the latter, though also asyndetic, the verb always stands at the head of the apodosis and is not so uniformly an imperfect as in the Neh. Mem. (Paragraph 11, Rem. c).

6. The participle with הָיָה which occurs in vv. 5, 22 (twice), and 26, is more characteristic of the Neh. Mem. than of Chronicles. It occurs fourteen times in the brief extract of chaps. 1—7. In Chronicles the participle in this use is found twenty one times, but in several instances there is a group of two or three participles after

one verb, e. g. 2 Ch. 30 : 10 b; 36 : 16, Ezr. 4 : 4—5, so that הָיָה itself is found only sixteen times. Considering the relative length of the two writings it occurs about seven times in the Neh. Mem. to once in Chronicles (Paragraph 73).

7. The frequency with which the participle is the predicate, also points to the influence of the Neh. Mem. Besides the four participles following הָיָה, there are six other predicate participles; vv. 17 (twice), 18, 21, 24 (twice). Relatively to its length the participle predicate is much more frequent in the Neh. Mem. than in Chronicles (about 4 to one; cf. Paragraph 45).

8. The interrogative sentence with מַדּוּעַ which occurs twice in this chapter, vv. 11 and 21, is found also in the Neh. Mem., 2 : 2 and 6. It finds no analogy in Chronicles. The only instance in which it occurs is borrowed from an earlier source based upon the parallel, 2 Ch. 24 : 6 || 2 K. 12 : 7.

9. The peculiar manner in which the one relative pronoun, אֲשֶׁר, serves to introduce two relative clauses having participle predicates, in the second of which the relative pronoun has a different construction from the first, v. 17, finds its counterpart in the relative clause in Neh. 1 : 6. In both passages the relative pronoun stands as object of the first participle, and in adverbial or prepositional relation to the second. In 2 : 13 also, there is an analogous change in the construction of the relative pronoun, though the first predicate here is a participle and the second a perfect.

The Chronicler does not present such an alteration in construction without a repetition of the relative pronoun. Compare the repeated pronoun under similar circumstances, in 2 Ch. 2 : 6.

10. The expression וַיֵּרַע לִי in v. 8 is peculiar and late. It is found in one other passage of the Neh. Mem., 2 : 10, but is never used by the Chronicler, who prefers the older manner of expression, וַיֵּרַע בְּעֵינֵי, 1 Ch. 21 : 7.

B. Points of syntax characteristic of Chronicles, but rarely or never used in the Neh. Mem.

1. The omission of וַיְהִי before a time determination four times in this chapter, vv. 1, 6b, 15, 21b, is a common form of syntax in Chronicles. In the Neh. Mem., on the other hand, וַיְהִי is never omitted except once when גַּם takes its place, 4 : 16 (cf. 3 and 4 above, and Paragraph 9).

The asyndetic perfect as apodosis is equally characteristic of Chronicles, whereas the Neh. Mem. shows a very strong preference for the imperfect with waw consecutive (cf. 3 above and Paragraph 10).

2. The nomen absolute which occurs twice, vv. 4—5 and 24a, is the work of the Chronicler rather than Nehemiah, for a sentence with a nomen absolute is nowhere found in the Neh. Mem. Both instances closely resemble the usage in Chronicles, in which such sentences are of frequent occurrence (Paragraph 12). In vv. 4—5 the nomen absolute representing the subject, which has an imperfect with waw consecutive as apodosis, finds a counterpart in 1 Ch. 5 : 18, 19, a passage apparently by the editor himself. Compare similar passages in the Midrashim or early Levitical source, 1 Ch. 28 : 5, 2 Ch. 25 : 13; 34 : 6—7.

In v. 24 the nominal sentence as apodosis is a frequent form in Chronicles (Paragraph 12, Rem. b). The nomen absolute itself, which represents a genitive and is not reproduced in the apodosis, is analogous to those of the Chronicler in Neh. 12 : 22a, 23b (König, § 341 h.).

3. The relative clause in v. 23, הַשָּׁרִים יָשְׁבוּ, is characteristic of the Chronicler in its syntax, whether the Massoretic text be retained giving an asyndetic relative clause, or the text be emended, supplying the article.[92] For both the asyndetic relative clause and the article as a relative are common in Chronicles whereas neither is found in the Neh. Mem. (Paragraph 17. The asyndetic clause in Neh. 11 : 17 is due to the editor).

4. The imperfect with waw consecutive twice takes the place of an object clause after אֲשֶׁר, vv. 9 and 19 (König, § 369 k.). A similar construction is found after אֲשֶׁר several times in Chronicles, 1 Ch. 14 : 12; 21 : 27; 2 Ch. 24 : 8; and after other verbs, 1 Ch. 14 : 13, Ezr. 3 : 8.

This use of the consecutive imperfect is never found in the Neh. Mem.

5. The perfect with the conjunction וְ which occurs twice in this chapter, vv 1 and 30, is characteristic of Chronicles, but

[92] Guthe, Siegfried, and Bertholet supply the article. This is not required by the antecedent which is determined by the article, for in Chronicles the antecedent of an asyndetic relative clause is generally determined, and several times has the article (Paragraph 17). The emendation, however, is favored by a similar use of the same verb with the article, in Ezr. 10 : 14, 17.

is never found in the Neh. Mem. Besides these two passages, it occurs in the book of Nehemiah only in the parts ascribed to the Chronicler or to the Ezr. Mem., Neh. 9 : 7 (twice), 8; 10 : 33; and in 12 : 39b which is generally regarded as a gloss. (Paragraph 7).

6. The infinitive with לְ in v. 13, is the subject infinitive expressing general possibility or obligation. This infinitive is unknown in the Neh. Mem. but is a distinguishing feature of the syntax of Chronicles, occurring eleven times (e. g. 1 Ch. 23 : 26; 2 Ch. 25 : 9b, etc., cf. Paragraph 35. The infinitive here bears a close relation to Ezr. 10 : 12, which has a similar prepositional predicate preceding the infinitive).

7. The gerundial infinitive which is found four times, vv. 7, 13 and 27 (twice), is a distinctive characteristic of Chronicles (34 times), but it is never found in the Neh. Mem. These infinitives, as they occur in this chapter are clearly explicative or modal-explicative in their significance, equivalent to the German „indem, dadurch, daß, insofern", (cf. Siegfried's translation and König, § 402 d) and are thus in perfect conformity with the usage in Chronicles (Paragraph 40).

8. The participle as secondary predicate is found in vv. 1, 13b, 16 (twice), and probably v. 22, שֹׁמְרִים (cf. König, 332k). This usage accords with a number of passages in Chronicles, e. g. 1 Ch. 15 : 28b; 2 Ch. 30 : 22, etc. (15 times in Chronicles and 7 times in the Ezr. Mem.). The Neh. Mem. offers no instance of this kind other than 7 : 5b, וָאֶמְצָא כָתוּב בּוֹ, an expression which so closely resembles certain passages in the Ezr. Mem. and in Chronicles, as to suggest that it is due to the hand of the reviser. Compare 2 Ch. 22 : 8 and the Ezr. Mem., Neh. 8 : 14; 9 : 8, all with the same verb מָצָא. Wellhausen, from a different standpoint, considers 7 : 5b as an addition to the Neh. Mem.[93]

9. The participle, שֹׁמְרִים, in v. 22, which has the verbal government and is followed by its object, is due to the Chronicler rather than to Nehemiah. For in the Neh. Mem. שָׁמַר regularly has the government of a noun in the construct with a following genitive, 1 : 5 (twice); 2 : 8; 3 : 29, while the Chronicler prefers with this participle the verbal government with an object; 2 Ch. 12 : 29; Neh. 12 : 25.

10. The preposition מִן with a substantive is used as an

[93] Cf. Bertholet's criticism of Wellhausen's view p. 67.

indefinite subject or object[94] in vv. 19, 25b, and 28. This is a very common mode of expression in Chronicles (27 times, e. g. 1 Ch. 9:3; 12:16, 19; 2 Ch. 14:12b, etc.).

In the Neh. Mem. it occurs but once, 5:5, and it may be questioned whether it is not there due to the reviser, for he seems to have altered the text of this chapter at several points; e. g., כָּל־הַקָּהָל preceded by a plural verb, 5:13b, which does not elsewhere occur in the Neh. Mem. but is common in Chronicles, 1 Ch. 29:20; 2 Ch. 29:31, 32; 30:23, 25, etc.; also לְהַרְבֵּה v. 18, which is found elsewhere in the Old. Test. only in 2 Ch. 11:12; 16:8, and which is explained by the Chronicler's preference for לְ.

11. The time determination with לְ, לְקֵץ in v. 6b is often found in Chronicles, e. g. לְקֵץ, 2 Ch. 18:2 לְיָמִים, 2 Ch. 21:19; 29:17; also לְ with other substantives, 1 Ch. 12:22; 2 Ch. 24:23; 36:10; Ezr. 20:8, etc.

In the Neh. Mem. it is found only in 5:18, לְיוֹם, and is probably due to the editor since he has altered the text of this chapter in several instances (cf. 10 above).

12. The last clause of v. 24, even though with Torrey it be regarded as a gloss, certainly resembles the peculiar incomplete sentence of Chronicles. It is not a contracted sentence, but the missing part must be supplied from the general sense of the context. It goes back here, not to the sentence immediately preceding it, but to the first sentence of the verse, בדבר. Compare 1 Ch. 18:10b where the Chronicler omits altogether the predicate which is fully expressed in 2 S. 8:10; and similar incomplete sentences in 1 Ch. 9:33b; 12:2b; 2 Ch. 11:22b; Ezr. 3:3, etc.

The expression עִם וְעָם in this sentence is also characteristic of Chronicles. Compare 1 Ch. 26:13; 2 Ch. 8:14; 11:12, etc.

Conclusion.

The conclusion from an examination of the syntax is that the Chronicler has made use of the Neh. Mem. as his source throughout the chapter. Even in vv. 1—3, which are chiefly due to his hand, the influence of his source is seen. It appears in the subject clause with אֲשֶׁר and in the use of וַיְהִי.

In the remaining parts the marks of the Neh. Mem. are stronger. At the same time the peculiarities of the editor of Chron-

[94] König, § 81.

icles are discernible at various points throughout the chapter. The intermingling of the characteristic usages of Chronicles with those of the Neh. Mem. gives evidence that the editor has used the same method of revision here as in certain parts of Chronicles in which he has worked over his sources to a large extent.

We find a thorough revision of the Neh. Mem. in this chapter similar to that which the narratives of Samuel and Kings have undergone in such passages as 2 Ch. 22 : 10—23 : 21 || 2 K. ch. 11; 1 Ch. chap. 21 || 2 S. chap. 24; 2 Ch. 1 : 6—18 || 1 K. 3 : 4—29.

Therefore while the syntax does not permit the extreme conclusion of Torrey, that the authorship of the whole chapter must be ascribed to the Chronicler, it nevertheless demands a larger recognition of the work of the reviser than is given by Siegfried, Bertholet, Ryle and others.

Printed by the Dissertations Printer Robert Noske, Borna near Leipzig.

R
N
B
18
84